

drastic alteration in our present method of government is badly needed, and I go further and say that we require an alteration of our State boundaries. When we talk about unification, and the centralisation of everything in Melbourne, I venture to express the opinion that there is no more centralisation in Melbourne than there is in Perth so far as the North-West is concerned. That, in my opinion, is sufficient to warrant the re-allocation of the boundaries of the States, and the functions of the various Parliaments, and, if necessary, we should abolish State Parliaments and introduce provincial councils, which would be a better solution of the difficulty existing to-day. I am sorry that Mr. Sanderson did not elaborate his motion a great deal more. Had he chosen to do so, he could have given the House valuable information. I do not propose to vote for the motion as it stands, because I am satisfied in the first place that it is not democratic to ask the Eastern States, with a bigger population than we possess, to consent to each State having equal representation. Secondly, I do not know whether Mr. Sanderson is prepared to alter the motion or to give us some assurance that he does not mean that the Convention will be only an advisory committee. I have no desire to support a motion which will merely involve a huge waste of time and money. After all, conventions of this sort, elected on the basis of proportional representation, mean that every section of the State will have the right to nominate a candidate.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: That is desirable.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: It is quite desirable; I agree with the idea, but it will cost a lot of money for such an election, and once the election is decided and the representatives are chosen, they will go over to the Eastern States at the expense of the country, they will be there for probably many weeks or months, discussing proposals, and then if those proposals are to be referred to the Federal Parliament, that body in turn will require a good deal of time to debate the decisions of the Convention and the end will be that the results of the Convention's deliberations will find their way into a pigeon-hole or the waste paper basket. After the able arguments Mr. Sanderson has advanced in this Chamber on the question of the financial position of the State, I am sure he has no wish to further burden Western Australia or any other part of the Commonwealth with an undertaking that will not do any good. Mr. Sanderson must also appreciate this fact, that if the members of the Federal Parliament as constituted at present are not prepared to frame proposals to submit to the people for the alteration of the Constitution, they are certainly not going to take proposals from any convention, and I have also to learn that the Federal Constitution gives power to a convention to frame proposals which may be submitted direct to the people. That

is the obligation of the Parliament we have created, and until the Constitution is amended in that direction, we shall only be wasting time. I do not propose to vote for the motion.

On motion by the Minister for Education, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.40 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 16th November, 1920.*

	PAGE
Questions: Wheat Board, members' status	1624
Police Benefit Fund	1625
Basic Wage, Government employees	1625
Agricultural Bank, loans	1625
Messages from the Governor	1625
Bills: Factories and Shops, report	1625
Public Service Appeal Board, Council's amendments	1625
Wheat Marketing	1628
Industries Assistance Act Continuance	1631
Stallions Registration, 2s. Com.	1632
Meekatharra—Horseshoe railway	1637
Lunacy Act Amendment, Com.	1640

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTION—WHEAT BOARD, MEMBERS' STATUS.

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Premier: Can he inform the House of the names of the members of the Australian Wheat Board who last week fixed the price of wheat for local requirements at 9s. per bushel, and also the status of each, whether representative of their respective Governments or of the wheat growers?

The PREMIER replied: The Premiers in conference—the Hons. J. Storey, H. S. W. Lawson, and H. N. Barwell—fixed the price. This was recommended by the Hons. Dunn, Oman, and J. G. Bice, and the farmers' representatives—Messrs. Drummond, Hill, and O'Loughlin—who form the Australia Wheat Board, together with our representatives.

Hon. P. Collier: That is not what I wanted.

The PREMIER: I will supply any information that the hon. gentleman desires concerning this matter if he will indicate what he requires.

**QUESTION—POLICE BENEFIT FUND.**

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN asked the Premier: 1, What is the total amount of money to the credit of the Police Benefit Fund? 2, How is it invested? 3, What interest per cent. per annum is received on the investment of the fund?

The PREMIER replied: 1, £29,246 11s. 6d. 2 and 3, £8,000 Local Inscribed Stock, bearing interest at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum; £3,610 Local Inscribed Stock, bearing interest at  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum; £6,330 Treasury bills, bearing interest at  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum; £11,000 Treasury bonds, bearing interest at  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum; £306 11s. 6d. Government Savings Bank, bearing interest at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum.

**QUESTION—BASIC WAGE, GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.**

Mr. CHESSON (for Mr. O'Loughlen) asked the Minister for Works: 1, Do the Government intend to apply to all State trading concerns the basic wage awarded to railway men? 2, Will the men employed at the Victoria Park timber yard be paid the basic wage?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The timber trade has a special award governing same, and when delivered by Mr. Justice Higgins will be applied.

**QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK LOANS.**

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Industries: 1, Will he cause inquiry to be made into the delay in granting loans applied for 12 months ago by A. Campbell, Shackleton? 2, Will he explain the delay?

The PREMIER, for the Minister for Industries, replied: 1, Yes. 2, The loan was applied for on the 19th May, 1920, and approved on the 25th June, 1920. The mortgage was signed and returned on September 1st, but was not registered, as the necessary fees were not remitted. The bank has now advanced the fees and forwarded Credit Authority to the Inspector, although it is against the policy of the bank to advance fees to civilian settlers.

**MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR.**

Messages received from the Governor recommending appropriations for the under-mentioned Bills:—

- 1, Wheat Marketing.
- 2, Industries Assistance Act Continuance.
- 3, Grain Elevators.

**BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS.**

Report of Committee adopted.

**BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD.**

Council's amendments.

Schedule of 9 amendments requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Clause 3, Subclause 2, paragraph (a): Strike out all the words after "by," in the sixth line, and insert "the members of the Civil Service Association of Western Australia."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

The effect of the amendment is that members to be appointed by the public servants, will be elected to the board in the prescribed manner "by the members of the Civil Service Association of Western Australia" instead of in the prescribed manner "by the public servants exclusive of the teaching staff of the Education Department." Thus, the members of the appeal board will be elected and appointed by the members of the Civil Service Association.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I welcome the amendment made by my friends in another place. It is not often that I have an opportunity of expressing or recording my satisfaction with the work of the Legislative Council. In this instance, I am pleased to say that they have succeeded in amending this Bill in a direction in which we endeavoured to amend it in Committee here, but failed. After all, there is hope for another place when they take such a broad-minded view of a question as is indicated in this instance. I am pleased that the appointment of representatives of the services on the appeal board will be in the hands of the Civil Service Association and of the Teachers' Union respectively.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 2—Clause 3, Subclause 2, Paragraph (b).—Strike out the words at the end, "teaching staff of the Education Department," and insert "members of the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

The effect of this amendment is the same as that of the last amendment, except that, in this case, it deals with the teachers and provides that the election of the representatives of the teachers on the appeal board shall be vested in the members of the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 3.—Clause 3: Strike out Subclauses 3, 4, 5.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

The amendment is consequential upon the amendments we have agreed to, and Subclauses 3, 4, and 5 are no longer necessary.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 4.—Clause 6, Subclause (1), Subparagraph (1): Strike out "or," in line (1), and insert after the word "salary" the words "or allowances."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

The clause deals with the jurisdiction of the board, and states that the board shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any appeal by any public servant or class of public servants from the Public Service Commissioner whether acting alone or in conjunction with assistant commissioners, or the Minister of Education in respect of the classification, re-classification, or salary of any such public servant, and so on. The amendment, as requested, is to add the words "or allowances," so that the board shall have jurisdiction to deal with allowances in addition to classification, re-classification, or salaries.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I looked up the report of the discussion in another place and found that one city member gave notice of this amendment and another city member actually moved it, but no reason was given as to why it was accepted. The word "allowance" might cover a very large number of cases, and it is difficult to imagine where those cases would end. It has been the practice that when one officer takes the place of another on leave, he gets half of the difference between his own salary and that of the officer on leave. This matter might be referred to the board. If an officer goes out of the State and the allowance is considered to be unsatisfactory, he might refer that matter to the board. This provision might also cover allowances to officers travelling within the State, and it might mean that we shall be paying a judge of the Supreme Court, two or three other officers, and a couple of lawyers to decide whether an officer is receiving the proper allowance or not. If there is a reason for it, well and good, but I have been able to find no reason whatever. Though Parliament is responsible to the people, Parliament will in future have no voice with regard to these matters. An officer who does extra work might be granted an additional allowance by a Minister, and the board might be called upon to inquire into the circumstances of that case. Surely the Minister in another place required some justification before accepting the amendment.

Mr. Thomson: There will be no need for Parliament presently.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No; in fact I would not be surprised if the Government decided to have another board to classify all the various boards which are being appointed.

The Premier: In New South Wales they have one to classify members of Parliament.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have sufficient troubles here without bothering about New South Wales.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not attach much importance to the amendment, except that I think it has been inserted by way of extra precaution: It is true that "allowance" is a wide term. On the other hand, we wish to make the clause wide in order to avoid all grounds for dissatisfaction in the service.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And give civil servants everything they want.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If there is any cause for dissatisfaction I see no reason why it should not be referred to a board especially appointed to arbitrate between the Government as employers and the public service as employees. I trust that the amendment will be accepted.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 5, Clause 6, Subclause (1), paragraph (b).—Strike out the word "or," in the fifth line, and insert after the word "salary" the words "or allowances."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This is a similar amendment. It is really to give a co-relative right to Ministers to object to decisions in the same way as the public service have the right to appeal against decisions.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 6, Clause 6, Subclause (1).—Insert the following new paragraph to stand as paragraph (e).—To determine, from time to time, on the application of the Civil Service Association of Western Australia or the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia whether any and what amounts shall be added to the salaries of all or any public servants or of all or any public servants in any class, by way of temporary allowance, and to fix the period of time during which such allowance shall continue, and to determine on the application of the Public Service Commissioner, the Minister for Education, or the Minister of any department concerned whether such temporary allowance shall cease or be reduced within such fixed period.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The new paragraph will give power to the Civil Service Association or Teachers' Union to move the board as regards a temporary allowance, and power is given to the Public Service Commissioner and the Minister of any department concerned to reduce any temporary allowance. The object of the clause is a good one. Take an instance haphazardly: A man on a salary of £150 claims £225. The

board are satisfied that having regard to the cost of living it would be reasonable to grant him £200. At the same time, they anticipate that the present cost of living is not necessarily a permanency, and in order to give what is fair to-day they fix his salary at £175 and make an additional allowance of £25 for, say, six months to meet the present cost of living. This would be an elastic method to enable justice to be done in accordance with the ever-changing state of affairs arising at present. If the board had no such power they might conclude that, while £200 was a reasonable salary to-day, they would not be justified in granting £200, having regard to the prospect of the cost of living falling. Under the proposed new clause they would be able to grant £175, and an allowance of £25 for, say, six months, and the officer could apply to have the period extended or the employers might ask to have the amount reduced. This would enable the board to give decisions which would be better adapted to present conditions than if we tied them down to granting an allowance based on present circumstances.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I understand that this amendment was moved in another place by the Minister for Education. Was it moved at the request of the Civil Service Association, or was there any understanding between the Minister and the members of the association with regard to the amendment?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I requested the Minister for Education to move the amendment, because this matter was not brought to my notice until the Bill had reached a stage in this House where it could not be altered. I do not know who mentioned it first, but I received from some of the members of the board an intimation that it would be desirable to give power of this description. I saw the representatives of the civil service and afterwards drew up this clause, and requested the Minister for Education to move it.

Hon. P. Collier: The civil service were agreeable to it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, they desire it.

The CHAIRMAN: Members will notice that the amendment proposes to add the new paragraph to stand as paragraph (e). On referring to the Bill I find that there is already a paragraph (e).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If this paragraph is inserted the paragraph now standing as paragraph (e) will become paragraph (f). I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 7. Clause 6, Subclause (3).—Add at the end of this clause the words "and his decision thereon."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The effect of the amendment is that a person who has

been employed on a daily or weekly rate of pay for a period of not less than five years shall have the right to apply to the Commissioner to be placed on the permanent staff. The amendment will give the board power to alter the decision of the Commissioner, and it seeks to add to the end of the clause the words "and his decision thereon." The amendment will vest in the board the power not only to find the facts on which the Public Service Commissioner has come to a conclusion, but will also give the board power to alter his decision. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 8. Clause 6, Subclause (4).—Add at the end the following: "the jurisdiction of the board shall also extend to such cases as have been the subject of correspondence between the Civil Service Association and the Government and that have arisen subsequent to the 1st July, 1916".

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The subclause to which it is proposed to add the words deals with the question of pensions. The board has power at the present time to determine whether a person is qualified under the Superannuation Act for a pension, and also as to the length of time he has served in a qualifying position. The amendment will give the clause a retrospective application to the 1st July, 1916. So far as I can make out, there are about 19 applications for pensions, and there are in dispute some six or seven. It is a difficult matter to obtain any definite principle upon which pensions have been granted in the past, and I can see no harm in making the power retrospective to July, 1916. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I want to know definitely whether this was part of the agreement which was entered into with the civil servants when the dispute was ended.

The Attorney General: Not the retrospective part of it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: An agreement was entered into by the Government with the service when the dispute was ended, and it was disastrous so far as the State was concerned. Now we find that the association has approached almost every member of Parliament by means of a letter pointing out that the Government have not embodied certain principles in the Bill. When the Bill was before the Assembly, members stuck to the Government, but the Council adopted a different attitude. The association, though they have received everything that was provided for in the agreement, now come along and say to another place, "We want to go further," and they induce another place to put something in the Bill which was never thought of at the time the Bill was introduced. The clause provides that the jurisdiction of the board shall begin

when the Act comes into force. That was in accordance with the original agreement entered into. But for that agreement, I would have opposed the whole Bill and said "Let the civil servants go to the Arbitration Court just as everyone else does." If arbitration is good enough for the labourer, it should be good enough for the civil servant. If I had my way I would send the whole blooming lot to the Arbitration Court. Now the civil servants are not satisfied; they want to go back four years. If hon. members will turn to page 1252 of "Hansard" No. 13 they will find there who the few interested persons are. We were told definitely that the Bill as it was presented to us was the outcome of an agreement. I am sorry, therefore, that the Attorney General proposes to give way not only in connection with this matter but in one or two other respects. I do not know whether it is his desire to cause a lot of trouble for whoever may follow him. I am confident that there will be serious trouble if this is allowed to go through. I intend to vote against the amendment of another place because it is not in conformity with the agreement which was arrived at.

The Premier: There was no agreement entered into.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have no desire to go over the whole ground again. The Government agreed to certain conditions before the service returned to work and those conditions were embodied in the Bill which was introduced to this House. Now we are asked to vote for something which was not in the original agreement. It is a wrong procedure to follow and I intend to oppose it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I hope the Committee will protect the public funds of the State by rejecting the amendment. To put it mildly, it is a most impudent amendment and I am surprised at the Attorney General accepting it. All those cases which have been decided since 1916 have been dealt with by the Executive Council, and it would mean that the Government would be prepared now to allow the board to act as an appeal court against the decisions of the Government during the past four years, as well as an appeal court against the decision of the Supreme Court which dealt with the test case in a former year. When we were in office between 1911 and 1916 scarcely a week passed without our being approached by someone who complained that he had a grievance because he was not drawing a pension. If we are going to make the Bill retrospective, then to be consistent and fair we should go further back and include everybody during the last 15 or 20 years. Why go back only to the 1st July, 1916? Because the member who moved in another place wanted to bring in a few gentlemen who happened to be friends of his. Not one of those who retired prior to 1916 was a friend of this gentleman and therefore the retrospective period was fixed for July, 1916. In the future, instead of the Executive Council deciding these matters, they will be referred to

the board for decision, and the board will have to review all those cases in regard to which there has been so much correspondence. The decision in those cases has been given, and no appeal board should have power to upset it. No doubt many officers retired from the public service without pension prior to the year 1916 would say, and perhaps rightly, that they have a greater claim to pensions than those officers whose cases are covered by this amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. Take the case of the late assistant Engineer-in-Chief.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Some officers have been retired because they were considered incompetent, and the Government in power held that such officers were not legally entitled to pensions under the Superannuation Act. Had those officers been so entitled, they could have claimed their pensions by action in the courts of law. The fact that they have not taken action is proof that they did not consider they were legally entitled to pensions.

Mr. PICKERING: Are regards this amendment, I agree with the leader of the Opposition. I have personal knowledge with regard to officers retired just prior to 1916; and why should not they come under this amendment, if it is made? Some officers who were retired for inefficiency now hold positions carrying good salaries, and it would be ridiculous to grant such officers pensions.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 9—Clause 7, Subclause 2, strike out the word "or" in the last line but one, and insert after the word "salary" the words "or allowance":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This is a consequential amendment on amendments Nos. 1, 4, and 5. I move—

That the Council's amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

## BILL—WHEAT MARKETING.

### Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Mitchell—Northam) [5.23] in moving the second reading said: This Bill really provides for the continuance of the Wheat Pool. It also proposes one or two small amendments in the existing legislation. The first is to extend the security over wheat held, to the products of the wheat when gristed; that is to say, the flour and bran and pollard. We have not that security at present. Then the Bill provides for the Government obtaining a sufficient indemnity in respect of duplicate certificates issued to replace certificates which have been lost by the holders. Provision is

made that the Minister may require certain notices to be published in the newspapers in connection with such cases. For instance, the Minister may publish notice of his intention to issue a duplicate certificate. I may say that not many certificates have been lost. Then by this Bill we ask that power be given to the Government to enter into an agreement with the Westralian Farmers Ltd. for the handling of this season's wheat, subject to certain minor amendments in the schedule to the existing Act. We all hoped last year that the condition of affairs in the world generally would have become normal ere this, and that there would be no necessity to continue the existing Act. However, financial conditions have not become normal. I feel sure hon. members will agree that for the provision of transport, and also in order to prevent competition for freight, it is desirable that the whole of the wheat of Australia should be handled by one authority.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You propose to use the people's money to make the people pay for wheat above its proper cost.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is perfectly right in saying that it is the people's money that is here concerned. It is not the farmers' money altogether, but the people's money. Our wheat production means everything to this State, and I am surprised to hear the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) say one word against the present proposal.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I shall say more about it before the Bill goes through.

The PREMIER: This Bill merely proposes certain slight amendments to the Act which the hon. member left to the Minister who succeeded him in office. The hon. member has said that he is very proud of that Act. I myself have heard him say how pleased he was with the usefulness of the measure.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But now you are proposing to burden the consumer. We will try to introduce an amendment or two into the Bill.

The PREMIER: I will give the hon. member time to prepare his amendments.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You should take six months to study the Bill.

The PREMIER: It is necessary to continue the operation of the existing Act, because it is necessary that the people who have wheat to export from this State should get a fair price for it, thus benefiting all the people of this country. Without the money obtained by the sale of our wool, our wheat, our timber, our gold, and other products, the country could not be carried on and there would be very little work in Western Australia. The higher the price we get for anything we put on a ship, the better for everybody here.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Hear, hear!

Hon. P. Collier: Let us profiteer on the foreigner as much as we can.

The PREMIER: I entirely agree with that sentiment. But without this Bill it cannot be done.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, it can.

The PREMIER: I hope the hon. member will show us some other way of achieving the same object. This legislation was initiated by the member for North-East Fremantle and the gentlemen associated with him.

Hon. P. Collier: All the good things that have been done in this State for the last 10 years were started by us. All the things done for the benefit of the farmer were done by Labour—the Wheat Pool, the Industries Assistance Board, and everything else of that nature.

The PREMIER: It is perfectly true that those things were started by hon. gentlemen opposite, but they have not been carried on by those gentlemen.

Hon. P. Collier: We carried them on until you turned us out of office.

The PREMIER: They were not carried on quite so well by hon. members opposite as they have been carried on since. At the same time, I have no objection whatever to those gentlemen taking credit for anything they did. I do not wish to detract from the merit of any of their acts in any way. I am willing to give them full credit for all they did. The formation of the Wheat Pool has been the salvation of the farmers of Australia, and particularly of the farmers of Western Australia, and may I say of the people of Western Australia too. Without this legislation there would have been a very much lesser quantity of wheat produced, and without the wheat there would be very little work indeed at Fremantle or in the country. The handling of the wheat provided a great deal of work during the years of war, years which would have been years full of unemployment trouble but for the 14 millions of money which our wheat produced. We have handled five harvests; totalling 53 million bushels. We have sold 51 million bushels for £14,382,000, which has been received. The amounts distributed amongst farmers on account of the different pools have been as follows:—1915-16 pool, £3,019,000; 1916-17 pool, £2,652,000; 1917-18 pool, £1,648,000; 1918-19 pool, £1,831,000; 1919-20 pool, £3,966,000, or a total paid out to the farmer of £13,116,000. But for the pool nothing like that sum would have been brought to the country by the sale of wheat; guarantees would not have been given to the farmer to encourage him to grow wheat, nor could the Australian wheat have been financed. The pool enabled us to sell wheat to the British Government when there was no chance of getting shipping; and millions of pounds were paid by the British Government for wheat when, in the absence of shipping, the wheat had to be stacked here, very often at the risk of the British Government. I agree with the leader of the Opposition that the pool has been of great benefit to the people. I think it ought to be allowed to continue

without a word of opposition from the member for North-East Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am opposing, not the pool, but the price.

Mr. Troy: We will continue the pool for good if you like.

The PREMIER: No one would continue it for evil.

Hon. P. Collier: Is it not somewhat of an interference with private enterprise?

The PREMIER: Perhaps so, but on the other hand it helps private enterprise since, after all, these thousands of farmers whom it is assisting are engaged in private enterprise. It is our duty to protect every producer whether he be farmer, miner, timber getter, or anything else. If, to-day, State were competing with State for the sale and shipping of wheat, or if farmer were competing with farmer, the price would not be anything like as satisfactory as it is. Therefore, I ask the House to agree to the continuation of the pool. If next year the position is much as it is at present, a further continuation will be asked for. Hon. members know the uncertainty of the world's financial position to-day. It is very difficult to sell wheat.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I thought it was pretty easy, and that they could get 14s. or 15s. per bushel for it.

The PREMIER: It is very difficult to sell. The Governments of some countries are compelled to prohibit importations of wheat, simply because the financial positions of those countries are so unsatisfactory that the Governments concerned cannot afford to have the purchases made. The embargo on trade due to exchanges will have a useful effect, because for some months to come only necessities will be imported. The position renders advisable the early export of our produce, so that we may get our credit re-established in London. And as it is with us so it is with the rest of the world. What I am concerned about is the getting of these sales made as soon as possible, so that we may have the money in circulation. During the past few weeks I have not been at all comfortable about employment in the State.

Hon. P. Collier: Which was the last pool to be absolutely cleaned up?

The PREMIER: Probably none of them is absolutely cleaned up, but all except the last have been practically cleaned up. We want to get from the people outside as much for our wheat as we can, and to get it as soon as we can. It would be suicidal to refuse to pass the Bill, because so much does really depend upon the favourable sales of our commodities.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: How can it be difficult to sell wheat when there is such a demand for it?

Hon. P. Collier: The demand is there, or the price would not be so high.

The PREMIER: If you can get shipping you can get your wheat away.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There are any number of ships available.

The PREMIER: But not available to Western Australia. Hon. members must realise that it is impossible to make sales to countries which do not want wheat or meat, or whose Governments have taken those commodities in charge and on present rates of exchange cannot pay for any purchases straight away, but require terms.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is why we have to pay a high price for local wheat—because they cannot sell it elsewhere.

The PREMIER: The price to the local consumer has nothing to do with the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: Yet we will manage to drag it in.

The PREMIER: No doubt.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The newspapers say that you will bring it in to-night.

The PREMIER: The newspapers have no right to say so. Not only this year, but I think probably next year, this same method of handling our wheat will continue. Hon. members know that sales have been made. I am not at liberty to disclose either the quantity or the price, and they know that the Australian Wheat Board, with the Ministers who met in Melbourne recently, determined that the price of wheat for local consumption should be fixed at 9s.

Hon. P. Collier: Who are they?

The PREMIER: Premiers and Ministers representing all States excepting Western Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: A majority of whom have wheat to sell.

The PREMIER: I do not know that they have. At any rate they have fixed the price at 9s.

Hon. P. Collier: We in this State have our sovereign rights.

The PREMIER: Yes, we have, and so we too have fixed the price at 9s.; we have adopted the price the others fixed. Of course we shall secure the wheat needed for the people of the State. It is true that the price of the loaf has been raised one-halfpenny. At Bunbury 4d. is charged for the loaf, at Northam 5d., and at Perth, I am told, 5½d. I want the House to pass the Bill, because it is necessary that we should have this statutory authority to continue the pool.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Did you say you were going to purchase the wheat required for the State?

The PREMIER: We shall secure it, certainly.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: For the whole season?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is at the request of the party in caucus the other day; political pressure again.

The PREMIER: Nothing of the sort, it is no such thing. We secured the whole of the wheat needed for last year. If it were necessary to do it last year, it is much more necessary this year, because I hope that every bushel available for export will be sent out of the country during the early months of the coming year. We must secure all that is necessary for local consumption, otherwise

we should be over-exporting. Would hon. members like to take the slightest risk in that regard? We propose to secure the wheat—not to pay for it, of course, until it is delivered week by week and month by month—we propose that sufficient wheat shall be retained in Western Australia to feed the people for the coming twelve months. I have nothing more to say on the question. I have explained the Bill. The same methods will be adopted in the handling of the wheat and the control of the scheme as were followed last year. Nothing has been altered in connection with either the Bill or the methods to be employed. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, debate adjourned.

## BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

### Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Mitchell—Northam) [5.43] in moving the second reading said: This, too, is a continuance Bill. We ask that an amendment shall be made to enable the Industries Assistance Act to be carried on for another twelve months. This also was an Act introduced by my friend, and a very good thing for Western Australia that it was introduced.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Very good until you abused it.

The PREMIER: I do not think we ever abused the hon. member's Act. What the hon. member means is that we have abused our powers under that Act. I do not think we have. Since the board came into existence we have advanced £4,050,870, and we have had returned to us 4,145,533. Those are the aggregate figures. Of course many accounts have not been as satisfactory as others. Some hundreds of farmers have got their clearances and taken a good deal of money away from the board; but we have had from those people in the aggregate more than we paid out. The advances made during the last 12 months amount to £712,000 and the amount outstanding to the 31st March last was £693,000.

Mr. Thomson: Is all that outstanding?

The PREMIER: That is the amount outstanding at that date. It is a long time ago.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why do you not give up-to-date figures? Do you expect this Bill to go through before we receive the report of the Industries Assistance Board?

The PREMIER: I do. We have paid away to merchants £210,000 and there is a further £40,000 to be distributed, making a total of £250,000. There still remains outstanding to outside creditors a sum of £392,000. I admit that the Act has operated rather harshly in the case of some outside creditors, because they have not been allowed to sue for amounts owing to them and have had to wait until dividends became available from time to time.

Mr. Troy: How much longer will you continue this legislation?

The PREMIER: For some time yet. I do not know that the outside creditors would have received as much as £250,000 but for this particular legislation. If they had forced the sale of the farms and assets, they would not have realised very much for them. They have not been so badly treated, therefore, after all. They have had about three million pounds in cash trade since the board was established. From 1916 onwards everything bought by the board has been paid for in cash.

Mr. Troy: To what firms?

The PREMIER: I do not know. This amount runs into millions. I do know that the farmers have bought where they pleased.

Mr. Harrison: Where the clients of the board desired!

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And the other poor devils have had to stand out of their money.

The PREMIER: I know what the hon. member is referring to. I do not say that the man who was being assisted by storekeepers with advances, prior to the time that he came under the board, is justified in taking his business away from such storekeepers. In my opinion he should stand by the man who stood by him in his hour of need. I have stated this as my opinion on several occasions.

Mr. Teesdale: It is a pity the farmers have not done this. Hundreds of thousands of pounds are at present owing to storekeepers.

The PREMIER: I think they have done this in many instances. At all events, I hope they have. Many of the farmers under the Industries Assistance Board owe no money at all. They have cleared off their debts to outside creditors.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Then they ought to be off the board.

The PREMIER: I do not know that this should be the case. The board has paid the Government a good deal of money in rents, interest, and so on. A considerable sum of money has also been paid to the old seed wheat board, and some to the State Implementation Works. Rents were only paid where the accounts justified it. In the early days of the war many clients had their rents paid for them and received no other advances. This Act has been responsible for keeping many people on the land.

Hon. P. Collier: Who initiated it?

The PREMIER: The Government to which the hon. member belonged.

Hon. P. Collier: Labour again!

The PREMIER: It was only an accident that they were in office at the time.

Hon. T. Walker: And a terrible accident that pushed them out of office.

The PREMIER: It was through no fault of my friends opposite that they sat on this side of the House. I had hoped that they would have allowed me to tell them what a very good Act this has been and what good work has been done under it. A great deal



of wealth has been brought to this State as a result of the passing of this legislation.

Hon. P. Collier: What is the good of praising people after their political death, although I do not think we shall be dead long.

The PREMIER: I wish to give the hon. member's party credit for what has been done in this respect. A little over four million pounds has been produced largely as a result of the efforts of this board. The same farms might have produced some of this money without the assistance of the board, but it can reasonably be credited with at least two millions of wealth which would not have been produced but for its activities.

Hon. P. Collier: Hear hear!

The PREMIER: I am glad to have that applause from the hon. member. The board has been the best means of protecting the securities of the Agricultural Bank. We have advanced a great deal of money for the clearing of land and the board has enabled us to control the crops. It is because we have exercised that control that these good results have been achieved. The board is a very useful institution. It is really the farmers' bank. One is the bank which finances the improvements, and the other is the bank which helps the farmer to crop his land.

Hon. P. Collier: The Act was a statesman-like conception.

The PREMIER: It was a necessity and there was no escape from it. If hon. members had suggested that such an Act should have been brought in before, I would have taken it up at the time. It was just the thing wanted to complete the scheme of farming development in the State. When we are dealing with wheat and wool, we are dealing with products that will keep.

Hon. P. Collier: We overlooked nothing where the producers were concerned.

The PREMIER: There is no doubt about that. The outside creditor has certainly been prejudiced to some extent—and protected also in other ways—by reason of the fact that no man under the board could be sued for any money that was owing by him. How long that state of affairs should continue is a matter for future consideration.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is about time that the Moratorium was wiped out.

The PREMIER: I do not know that we need bother about this particular question of outside creditors for the present. I hope the House will pass this continuance Bill. I would also point out that 497 returned soldiers have been assisted under this Act. There is special provision for them. But for this legislation we should not have been able to assist them in the way we have done. A great deal of expense and trouble has been saved as a result of the present system. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin debate adjourned.

## BILL—STALLIONS REGISTRATION.

Second reading.

Debate resumed from 28th October.

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY (Moore) [5.55] This Bill should not be allowed to pass without some little consideration being given to it. It is indeed a matter that has been discussed by Parliament for the last 20 or 25 years. In view of this there must be some difficulty about it. There is no doubt we should regulate the use of stallions. In another place when the measure was being introduced it was stated that the gist of the Bill was contained in Clause 16. This says that no uncertificated stallion shall be used on mares except they be the property of the owner. Many people who breed horses have their own stallions. If they are allowed to use stallions which are unsound, it seems to me this Bill will be of very little use. The Bill only applies to horses that are let out for stud purposes. It does not apply to stallions used by the owners themselves. If we are to have a good breed of horses in this country we should not allow people to use unsound stallions. Too many of such animals are found in this country, and are a nuisance to the community in general. If people were obliged to get a certificate for their stallions that trouble would be obviated. I would go so far as to say that no uncertificated stallion should be used at all for breeding purposes. We should see that the individual horse owner gets good stallions. When the matter was mentioned in the House many years ago, it was not the desire of those who represented pastoral communities that anyone should be exempt from the necessity for having stallions certificated. In those days many hon. members who were interested in horse breeding were quite willing to put up with the inconvenience of having to take out certificates for their horses, and were quite agreeable that none but certificated stallions should be used in Western Australia. The provisions of the Bill appear to me to meet all that is necessary, but before the House passes Clause 16, I should like members to consider it well, in order to decide whether or not such a provision should remain in the measure. If that clause passes, owner of horses breeding their own stock will not be allowed to breed unless from certificated animals. Members will probably suggest that such a clause interferes with the liberty of the subject. I am one of those who object strongly to interference with the liberty of the subject in many directions.

Hon. P. Collier: So am I

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY: But we interfere with the liberties of the people every day. For instance, I have been accustomed

for very many years to walking on the right side of the footpath.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Now they have made a silly alteration.

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY: And I have to walk on the left. That is interference with the liberty of the subject, but still I am obliged to act up to the new regulations.

Hon. P. Collier: Our Standing Orders constitute an interference with the liberty of members.

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY: We should not look upon this matter as a question of interference with the liberty of the subject. Every one who has any regard for breeding stock, will be only too glad to have that stock improved. I would like members who have not fully considered the Bill, to look into this aspect and consider carefully whether the provision should become law or not. It is certainly worthy of consideration.

Mr. MALEY (Greenough) [6.3]: It is rather late in the day to introduce a Bill of this description because we know that machine haulage is practically driving horses off the road.

The Premier: We do not know that yet.

Mr. MALEY: The time is not very far distant when, judging by the progress we have made in the past five or six years, this will come about, and horsepower will become practically a thing of the past. If it is necessary to make provision for the registration of stallions, it is equally necessary to register rams for the breeding of sheep?

Mr. Pickering: And for cattle too.

Mr. MALEY: And dogs. Why should this legislation deal only with horses?

Hon. P. Collier: It is serious. It raises the question of engines. It may involve the human race.

The Honorary Minister: Are you anxious?

Mr. MALEY: While the member for Moore agreed that the men in the country should be encouraged to breed good stock, the effect of such a provision as the registration of stallions may deprive many country districts, where they are no stallions travelling for service, of opportunities to breed at all. There are not so many districts, apart from the more thickly populated areas, where sires are actually travelled on the road for stud purposes. While I repeat that the measure is rather late in the day, I have no objection to the Bill beyond pointing out that if the Minister is so concerned about the registration of one particular class of stock, it should be just as imperative and necessary to compel all classes of stock to work under a similar provision.

The Premier: And human beings too?

Mr. MALEY: I leave that to the Premier for his consideration.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [6.6]: I should like to support the remarks of the member for Moore (Sir Henry Lefroy). Coming from the South-West, I know that there is

a demand for such a Bill with a view to the improvement of stock. I do not think this will have the desired effect to any great degree. I do not agree with the member for Greenough in his contention that the measure is belated because, if it is true, as he suggests, that horses are going out of use, that very fact shows that it is most important that the animals which remain in use, should be greatly improved.

Mr. MALEY: That follows, of course.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not think horses will go out for some considerable time yet. I would like to see some provision in the Bill to cover bulls, because the dairying industry is advancing in importance in Western Australia.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss dairying in connection with the Stallions Bill.

Mr. PICKERING: I was just pointing out that it would be a wise step to include in this Bill the registration of other stock, which are of importance to the State in connection with the industry of dairying. I hope that the Minister in charge will afford us an opportunity to amend the Bill in the direction I suggest.

The Premier: You have the opportunity now.

Mr. PICKERING: I agree, with the member for Moore, that it would be advisable to amend the measure so that only registered stallions should be used.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Mitchell—Northam) [6.8]: I hope it is understood by hon. members that the Bill is intended to cover horses standing for a fee. How would it be possible to bring all stallions under this provision? Imagine asking the owners of stallions in the Kimberleys, for instance, to bring their horses down for examination!

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You could send the board to them.

The PREMIER: Surely such an owner is entitled to do as he likes, and to suggest dealing with animals up there would be ridiculous. As a matter of fact, many of the best horses come from stock where no stallion was ever controlled or interfered with. Take the Timor, the Arab, and the Percheron; the breeding in those strains was never interfered with. It was a question of the horse with the greatest courage; he dominated the herd. It was not the case of the stallion which looked best in the show. The horses I have named are easily the best in the world. It would be disastrous to the interests of the State to limit the number of stallions because courage is an absolute essential in the horse. You do not get courage in the offspring if there are too few stallions. Carbine was a horse that stood for a big fee but he did not have 60 or 70 foals in a year. He had only 10 or 12 and they all possessed courage. We cannot afford to limit the stock in a country like Western Australia. All we can say is that if a man travels a stallion round the country districts

for a fee, he shall register that animal. To suggest that we should include bulls and rams under this legislation, is going too far.

Hon. P. Collier: Why?

The PREMIER: There would be tens of thousands of animals scattered about this country, quite apart from those which this Bill deals with now. Every bull, as well as a ram, is useful so long as it is well.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the case with horses as well.

The PREMIER: Yes, but there are many wasters in this State. It was proposed to export many horses from Western Australia during the war. Sentiment stepped in, however, and they were not sent away. It would have been a good thing for this State had those horses been got rid of, for they were neither useful nor beautiful. I hope members will pass the Bill and that they will realise that we cannot afford to say a man shall not use a stallion on his farm—

Mr. Hickmott: We should be able to say that a man must not use a diseased stallion. The disease may be hereditary.

The PREMIER: We cannot stop a man from doing as he pleases on his own farm.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You won't let him sell his wheat, at any rate.

The PREMIER: This measure is before the House in accordance with the people's request. When the Labour Government were in office, I think the same request was made by the Royal Agricultural Society, namely, that those stallions which stand for hire should be dealt with by legislation. That one aspect is quite sufficient for us to deal with now. It is essential that we should keep up a good standard of breeding. It would be a good thing if we had the same type of horse that we had 30 or 40 years ago, when the Indian horse trade provided a splendid market for our animals. There is the same opportunity to-day, but we have not got the same type of horse now. What we have includes too much rubbish.

Mr. Pickering: That is right.

The PREMIER: In the eastern wheat belt the member for Claremont has a very good stud farm, and the horses are doing good for the State.

Hon. P. Collier: What happened to that stallion of Mr. Lovekin's? It died from exhaustion.

The PREMIER: It was a fine animal. It did the decent thing by the State. We must deal with these horses that stand for fees. If members, however, believe that because a stallion is unsound the foals will be unsound, they are much mistaken, because a horse is often unsound as the result of an accident.

Mr. Pickering: What about diseased stallions?

The PREMIER: It all depends what is meant by disease. There is one disease, of course, but there are not many suffering from that. I hope the House will agree that where a man offers the services of a stallion, that animal shall be passed by a veterinary surgeon.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [6.14]: This is an important measure because if we are to legislate for the registration of animals, and if they are to be permitted to go round the country for service, it is essential that we should know that they are properly certificated for soundness.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. HARRISON: Before tea I was emphasising that this Bill was more important than one would be apt to judge from the opinions expressed by various people with whom we come into contact. People generally do not seem to realise the necessity for a measure of this description which will enforce the registration of animals that should be true to type. The object of the Bill is to protect those persons who pay big fees for the service of any stallion for breeding purposes. If we are going to have the best type, it is essential that that type should be fixed by several generations of horses true to type. The clauses of the Bill show that it is desired to prevent any bone growths or defects which are hereditary from being transmitted from one generation to another. We know that certain bone growths are hereditary. This Bill will prevent the registration of stallions which are not certified by the veterinary surgeons as being free from such defects. The Bill will have a two-fold benefit. It will ensure to owners of mares who avail themselves of the service of horses travelling in the district that such horses are true to type, free from bone growth, and certificated by veterinary surgeons. There is no penalty in this measure for the falsification of pedigrees. In Britain drastic provision has been made to deal with offences of this kind, and the penalty is imprisonment without the option of a fine. Unless the animals are true to the five distinct crosses, they are not classed as pedigreed stock, and are not considered eligible for the book. The object of this provision is to ensure that these animals shall be bred true to type, and similar provision should be made here to guard against falsification. There are unscrupulous men who would not hesitate to say that an animal possessed a certain pedigree, but it should be incumbent on anyone travelling an animal for stud purposes and charging fees to verify the description according to the stud book in which the animal is registered.

Mr. DUFF (Claremont) [7.35]: The member for Avon (Mr. Harrison) has referred to the stud book. It is very desirable that the stud book system should be introduced into this State. Up to the present we cannot claim any credit for having bred horses anywhere near equal to those bred by our Eastern States friends. Those who go in for horse breeding do not look around this State for first class breeding animals, but go to the Eastern States for Clydesdales and such like.

The Honorary Minister: What about Sparkle? It was good enough to go over there and scoop the pool.

Mr. DUFF: I am referring particularly to farm horses such as Clydesdales. There are contractors on the goldfields engaged in carting firewood for the goldmines. These contractors find that they cannot get in Western Australia the class of horse necessary for hauling the heavy loads of firewood to the railways. If this Bill is passed, it will go a long way towards improving the breed of horses in this State. We cannot claim that we are now breeding horses suitable for all purposes. We may be improving, but we have to thank Messrs. Padbury, Mills & Co., and a few more gentlemen of the same ilk for having introduced some very fine stock into this State. If one looks around the farming districts, he will find that the horses in general use are too small, and as time goes on they seem to be getting smaller. By insisting upon the registration of stallions, the Clydesdale breed, the horse chiefly used on the farm, must be greatly improved. Seeing that we are opening up such large areas of land and that new settlers are always on the look out to buy within the State suitable horses, without going to the expense of importing from the Eastern States, the passing of this measure should go a long way towards making possible the supply of these needs locally. I trust that the Bill be accepted with very little amendment.

Mr. TEESDALE (Rochbourne) [7.40]: I wish to refer particularly to Clause 16, which provides that no uncertificated stallion shall be used for stud purposes except on mares the property of the owner or one of the owners of the stallion. I think it is wrong to make any exception of that kind. Because a man is the owner or one of the owners of a stallion, that is no reason why he should perpetuate a lot of runts which are of a stallion, that is no reason why he should perpetuate a lot of brumbies which he may be breeding at the time. He should be in the same position as a man who has bought a very expensive stallion and is travelling the stallion for hire. Apparently because a man is the owner or one of the owners of a stallion, he can serve his own mares without being debarred in any way. It is wrong to practically offer a premium to have a lot of brumby mares served, the offspring of which must be very inferior, and no credit whatever to the State. We might reasonably ask an owner of mares to stand in the same position as the owner of a horse travelling for hire.

The Premier: I do not think you can do that.

Mr. TEESDALE: I think it can be done.

Mr. Underwood: How would you get a horse in the Kimberleys examined?

Mr. TEESDALE: I do not care where a horse is examined. I am out to prevent a lot of useless mares from being served. We

expect owners to buy first class stock and pay big figures for them, and we should do our best to prevent these £10 hires being used for breeding. We want to try to improve the breed of horses and we must endeavour to improve the position of the man who buys high-priced horses.

Question put and passed; Bill read a second time.

#### In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Constitution of board of control:

Hon. P. COLLIER: This Bill contains a proposal for another board. I do not know what subtle influence has been at work with members of the Government during the present session.

The Premier: Have a select committee to inquire into it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, let us set up a board, and that will be quite in accord with the policy of the Government in connection with all the Bills introduced this session. I never remember any session in which Bills have been introduced to such an extent and have provided for the handing over of the government of the country to various boards. Shortly we shall have to dissolve Parliament, because there will be nothing left for us to do. Everything in the departments will be in the hands of boards.

Mr. Smith: Government of the people by the people.

Mr. Underwood: Before March could not we ourselves get on a board?

Hon. P. COLLIER: If we continue through the remainder of the session to pass Bills which make provision for government by boards, everyone who has the misfortune to miss the winning post at the next elections should be provided for by appointment to one or other of these many boards. We have the architects' board, the public service appeal board, the dentists' board, the opticians' board, and now we have a stallions' board, and many other boards are to follow. Cannot the different departments administer this measure without the assistance of a board? It seems to me that we require a board now to administer every measure that we pass. But there has been one omission. We forgot to provide for a board to administer the Factories and Shops Bill. Let us get a record of the number of boards we have already provided for this session, and let us be uniform, that is to say, let us provide that every Bill shall be administered by a board. But seriously, I would ask why this Bill cannot be administered by the head of the Stock Department. Whatever happens the inspectors will remain and we shall be piling up a board over the heads of the inspectors.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Anyone who has studied the Bill will see that a board

is not only justified but necessary. It is a serious thing to examine a stallion and condemn it. The owner of the stallion perhaps would not be satisfied with the sole decision of the chief inspector. Under the Bill the chief inspector would have two qualified men to act with him, and should the owner of the animal wish to appeal against the disqualification of the stallion he would be able to do so, and the board would consist of men who would be conversant with the duties they would have to perform.

Mr. MALEY: In connection with the examination of stallions and stud stock brought down for show purposes, the work is performed by the chief inspector, and if the Honorary Minister wants to argue that the chief inspector is not competent—

The Honorary Minister: No; what I said was that the owner of a stallion would not be content to take the chief inspector's disqualification and his only.

Mr. MALEY: Will he take the board's disqualification?

The Honorary Minister: Yes.

Mr. MALEY: Where is the redress from the board's finding? Can we get anyone more competent than the chief inspector? I have never known an exhibitor of stock to declare himself dissatisfied with the findings of the chief inspector. We are creating another department unnecessarily.

Mr. DUFF: I am surprised to hear from the member for Greenough that breeders of horses are well satisfied to take the judgment of the Chief Inspector of Stock. We find that at the Royal Show there are very few breeders of the particular class of stock that I go in for, namely, Clydesdales. I know of the case of a gentleman who paid 500 guineas for a horse which had a clean certificate from New Zealand. Four months before the Show at Claremont that same horse had a clean certificate from Victoria, and yet when the horse came along it was asked to stand aside on the judgment of the chief inspector. That officer may have been right, but the owner of the horse was incensed and he was backed up by other breeders present who also examined it and said that the decision was not right. If we want to encourage people to bring good stock to this country we want to give them to understand that they are going to have a fair deal, and, seeing that we are about to introduce drastic legislation, it is not right that we should depend on one man for a decision.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The least harm that the board can do is to create expense. I am certain it will not do any good. The Honorary Minister's argument is that we cannot rely on our Chief Inspector of Stock.

The Honorary Minister: I never said that. I said that we should not rely solely on him, as the public would be dissatisfied.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: What improvement would result if we appointed two men who were not veterinary surgeons or stock inspectors, to overlook the work of a stockman?

The other members of the proposed board are not to be appointed to examine stock, but simply to have chats with the Chief Inspector of Stock and to receive reports from stock inspectors in various parts of the State and then to decide on those reports. A board of laymen are not likely to know as much as the Chief Inspector of Stock. This proposed board would be the most unnecessary board ever heard of. If a board composed of 100 members disqualified a horse, its owner would still be dissatisfied.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: What are the views of the Royal Agricultural Society regarding the board?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Royal Agricultural Society, and also the Pastoralists Association, have expressed themselves in favour of the board. In fact, all sensible people are in favour of the Bill as it stands. Wipe out the board, and the Bill is wiped out. No satisfaction at all will be obtained from the Chief Inspector of Stock acting by himself.

Mr. Pickering: Who has been issuing certificates of soundness?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Of what value are the certificates of soundness issued up to date? If the Bill passes, the owners of stallions already certificated by one veterinary surgeon, but condemned by another veterinary surgeon, will be able to approach the board and get finality, which is not attainable to-day. The men appointed to sit on the board with the Chief Inspector of Stock will be highly qualified and thoroughly competent men.

Hon. T. Walker: How are their qualifications to be judged?

The HONORARY MINISTER: We have the Royal Agricultural Society's list of judges throughout the State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The members of the board would have to be professional men.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Naturally, they would be professional men. The position of the Chief Inspector of Stock under present conditions is a most invidious one when he has to refuse a certificate of soundness to a stallion certified elsewhere to be sound. If the board endorse such a decision by the chief inspector, then we could say that the horse had become unsound since being examined outside this State. The Chief Inspector of Stock could not possibly issue or refuse certificates of soundness in respect of every stallion throughout this huge State.

Mr. MALEY: Under Clause 11 the question of soundness is to be determined by the opinion of the veterinary surgeon alone. The Bill provides that the ultimate authority shall be the veterinary surgeon appointed to the board. The Chief Inspector of Stock being a veterinary surgeon, surely his opinion in such a matter would be better than that of some other veterinary surgeon appointed by the Government to the board. Why create another public department, with all the usual trimmings? That is what the proposed board will amount to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the board are appointed, where are they to get funds from to carry on with?

The Honorary Minister: The last clause of the Bill shows where the money is to come from.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then this is a money Bill, appropriating funds of the State, and should have been introduced in the Assembly, and not in the Council. Moreover, it should have been recommended by a Message from the Governor.

The Premier: This Bill does not appropriate money.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, it does.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I raise the point, Mr. Chairman, that this is a money Bill, that it has been wrongly introduced, having originated in the Council instead of the Assembly, and that it has not been recommended by a Message from the Governor.

Progress reported.

## BILL — MEEKATHARRA-HORSESHOE RAILWAY.

Second reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Mitchell—Northam) [8.19] in moving the second reading said: The Bill asks authority for the construction of a private line by a private company. The line will run from a point 601 miles from Perth, really the terminus of the Geraldton-Meekatharra railway, north to Peak Hill, and thence north-west to the Horseshoe lease, a distance of 85 miles. As is usual with lines of this kind, it will be surveyed by the department controlled by the Minister for Works. Crown lands are to be leased for purposes of the railway for 99 years, and where private lands are taken the owners of the line must pay the cost of resumption. As usual, the Government will have the right of purchase at any time during the currency of the lease, the price to be determined by the Engineer-in-Chief and to be a sum not greater than the cost of the railway less depreciation. The railway must carry passengers and goods, and for this purpose by-laws may be made by the company, but must be approved by the Government. The great point to remember is that the line will not only render practicable the exploitation of a magnificent deposit of manganese ore, but will serve the people adjacent to the railway; quite apart from the fact that it will open up the mine, it will be useful to the people of a closely settled district carrying large numbers of stock. It is not often the House is asked to approve of the construction of a private line of this length.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It is the first time.

The PREMIER: Of course we do grant permits for the laying down of woodlines.

Mr. O'Loughlen: And there was the line to Lake Clifton.

The PREMIER: Yes. Occasionally permits have been granted for private com-

panies to lay down woodlines of considerable length. All that we are doing now is to grant to this company the right to do as the woodline companies are empowered to do. It is very fortunate that we have a company willing to invest the money necessary to the laying down of this line. Of course, they will be opening up a manganese deposit of considerable magnitude. The railway is necessary for the working of that deposit. The line will not cost the country a shilling, while, on the other hand, it will mean considerably increased traffic over the State line between Meekatharra and Geraldton, and, indeed, should render that section of our railway system payable. There seems to be no doubt whatever about the quantity of material which can be mined and passed over our railways. We have a report from Mr. G. V. S. Dunn, a capable mining engineer, who estimates that there is on the surface 2,700,000 tons of high-grade ore, valued at 27 million pounds. Mr. Montgomery, our own mining engineer, reports that the deposits contain not less than  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million tons of ore of good marketable quality, very easily obtainable by open excavation, and that most probably there are greatly larger quantities of ore below the superficial crust, which alone has been taken into account in this figure. Mr. Montgomery goes on to say that the quantity in sight justifies the construction of a railway to connect the mines with the State railway system at Meekatharra, and of ore loading bins and appliances at Geraldton, and that, once the railway has been built, there seems no reason to fear that the mines cannot put their ore upon the world's market in open competition with that of India. This report concludes with the statement that the proposition is a very important one for this State, the present value in England of the ore now in sight being approximately 13 million pounds. There is a manganese ore famine in England, and last year Great Britain was over 100,000 tons of ore short. The Imperial Government, I am told, are doing everything possible to increase their supplies. Manganese ore is used in the manufacture of steel, which is of the utmost importance to every part of the Empire. A company willing to undertake the expenditure necessary in connection with this work, and which will mean the employment of a very large number of men, ought to be encouraged. It is not likely the Government themselves will at any time desire to run a railway through that part of the State to be traversed by this line, but if we should require to do so we can always resume the line at its value, less depreciation. Everything in this proposal seems to be fair and reasonable, and the line, when completed, will be of real benefit to the State. In this country, with the population so widely scattered, and where there is so much to do with the funds at our disposal, we ought to welcome a proposition such as this. It does not mean that we are giving

a concession for all time, but it does mean that we shall have the country opened up by this company under conditions absolutely fair and which will amply protect every interest concerned. I do not know what capital will be required for the construction of the line and the opening up of the mine, but probably nothing under a quarter of a million of money. In passing the Bill, the House will be providing for the establishment of an industry entirely new to Western Australia. I should probably not have asked the House to agree to this proposal but for the report of the State Mining Engineer which I have read. The asset is too valuable to be allowed to lie idle longer than is necessary. It can only be opened up by means of a railway. Such a railway could not be laid down at the expense of the State at this time. In order that this deposit may be worked I recommend the House to agree to the passage of this Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. CHESSON (Cue) [8.31]: I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill. Although I am not in favour of private lines as a rule, I see the Government have made every provision to safeguard the interests of the public in this matter. The Government will have the right during the term of the lease to take over the line by paying the cost of construction less depreciation. Provision is also made for the lessees to carry passengers and goods at rates to be prescribed.

Mr. Hudson: By the owners.

Mr. CHESSON: No. The Bill says it shall be lawful for the lessee and his assigns during the continuance of the lease to carry goods and passengers over the railway at such charges and subject to such conditions as shall be prescribed under by-laws framed under this Bill. The line will be about 87 miles long, and will connect Meekatharra with the country to the north. It will also serve Ruby Well, Peak Hill, Mt. Fraser, and the Horseshoe Range, and will lessen the distance of cartage to and from the Mt. Egerton gold mines and the Ilgarare copper mine. There is a large amount of first class copper in this district. A good deal of it has been sent away at a cost of £8 per ton to Meekatharra. This line will lessen the distance by 86 miles over which this cartage has to be done, and will make a big difference to these particular fields. The manganese deposits have been reported on by the State Mining Engineer and by Mr. G. S. V. Dunn. According to the State Mining Engineer there is a million tons of manganese in these deposits. If the railway can carry 50,000 tons of ore per month, there will be enough traffic to last 20 years. This line will also be of big assistance to the pastoralists in this area. During the hot months of the year it is impossible to bring cattle down from this particular centre. It will also open up the goldfields close to the spot

where this manganese is situated. I hope the Bill will meet with no opposition.

Mr. MALEY (Greenough) [8.34]: Whilst I support this Bill and congratulate those concerned in having had this necessary legislation brought forward, I wish to give notice that in Committee I intend to move that certain provisions be embodied in it similar to those contained in the Bill passed last session for the construction of the line from Ajana to Geraldine. The Ajana and Geraldine railway should have been constructed entirely by the Government. It has not yet been built, and I hope the line now before us will have a little more luck than the other did. In this Bill it is proposed to give the lessee and his assigns power to carry goods and passengers over the railway at such charges and under such conditions as may be prescribed by by-laws framed under the Bill. Clause 10 also gives power to the holder of the lease to make by-laws and charge what rates for passengers and goods traffic he may desire.

Mr. Jones: Subject to the approval of the Government.

Mr. MALEY: The owners of the Ajana-Geraldine line, had to make provision for the carriage of passenger and goods traffic subject to the line being under the supervision of the Minister for Railways, and they were so bound by another clause that the Governor-in-Council has power to make by-laws for the regulation of traffic and prescribe the charges to be made for the carriage of passengers and goods, as well as impose certain penalties. Subject to this amendment, the Bill will have my support.

Mr. MULLANY (Menzies) [8.36]: I support the second reading of the Bill and congratulate the lessee on the enterprise that is being shown in this matter. I trust the venture will be a profitable one for the State. The Government in framing the Bill have imposed a safeguard which will conserve the interests of the general public. I think they could have gone a little further. Will the Premier inform me how long this Bill will remain in force when passed, and what length of time will be given for those concerned to construct this railway? As the Bill stands at present, the company could hold this right for all time.

The Premier: Not at all.

Mr. MULLANY: I have no desire to hamper the operations of the company in any way. It may take some time to complete the necessary arrangements for the construction of this line, and some limitation as to the duration of this concession should be stated in the Bill. I would be satisfied with a limitation of not less than three years. In the absence of a satisfactory explanation on this point I shall, when in Committee, move in this direction.

Mr. TROY (Mount Magnet) [8.40]: Were times normal I should oppose the second reading of this Bill. I have strong

objections to any concessions being given to a private company for the construction of a railway over an area of country through which one day undoubtedly a main line of railway will pass. I am certainly not in favour of the wild cat scheme inaugurated by Mr. George Miles and his northern party for the construction of a railway from Meekatharra to Kimberley. The time for this is most inopportune, and I have no desire to waste my breath and energy in advocating any proposal which cannot by any possible chance be a success.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a heroic proposition.

Mr. TROY: This is not the time to indulge in heroics. I have no doubt, however, that some day the Government railway which at present ends at Meekatharra will be carried right through to the Kimberleys. That time may come sooner than we anticipate, but must have for its warrant satisfactory mining developments in the portion of the country affected. All that, however, is in the future. The Government would not construct any railway unless the population justified them in doing so, and there can be no immediate population of any size without a big development in the mining industry. The pastoral industry alone would not cause a railway such as that advocated by Mr. Miles, to pay. We are given to understand by the Government and the authorities, whose reports have been commented on by the Premier, that there are large manganese deposits at Horseshoe, near Peak Hill, which are very valuable to this country and would bring great wealth to us if this railway were constructed and properly worked. We know that the State at present is not in the position to build such a railway. At the same time we should be very careful in giving a concession to any company which might not intend to proceed with the work immediately.

The Premier: We can take it over at cost at any time.

Mr. TROY: That is not the position.

The Premier: Yes, it is.

Mr. TROY: I want to know from the gentlemen who have more knowledge on the question than we have, whether a company for the working of this lease has been floated, and whether that company are prepared to build this railway. Is this Bill an immediate necessity? Is the money available, and are all the plans prepared, for the building of the railway? We might pass this measure, and the railway might not be constructed for 10 years.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Put a time limit on it.

Mr. TROY: Yes, and a reasonable limit, too. That would be quite justifiable if the manganese deposits are of such great value as we are led to believe. I have read a report in the Press that large financial interests in London are prepared to undertake the immediate development of the deposits. I understand it has been given out that the money required for that purpose can be

found at once. We want to know, therefore, when the gentlemen interested in this Bill are prepared to start on the construction of the railway? Without some sound indication that the people concerned are prepared to go on with the work, I am not prepared to grant such a concession. There would be danger in doing so; somebody else might want to construct this railway, and find himself blocked by reason of this measure. Therefore, we should fix a time limit of, say, 12 months. This would give the company a year in which to begin the work of construction. Indeed, the people concerned should be in a position to come here and say, "We have floated the mines, and the money for the construction of the railway is available." If they are not in a position to say that, then the Bill has been introduced too early. I yield to no man in the desire to see the Murchison prosper. Like the member for Cue (Mr. Chesson), I have been interested in the Murchison district ever since I have been a resident of Western Australia, now a period of 24 years. I still represent that country, and I wish to see it developed; but I do not wish to grant a concession which may prove disadvantageous to the residents of the district and to the people as a whole. We ought to have more information. If the Bill passes—and I have no great opposition to offer to its passage—I hope Parliament will provide that the fares and freights to be charged on the proposed railway shall be similar to those charged on the Government railways, and that any alteration in fares and freights on the proposed railway shall be subject to the approval of the Government. Furthermore, the company should have no right to prevent anyone from travelling on the railway.

The Premier: They could not do that. They must carry passengers.

Mr. TROY: I understand from the member for Greenough (Mr. Maley) that some such condition was insisted upon in connection with the Ajana-Geraldton Railway Act. If that is so, this Bill should impose the same condition. Realising that measures of this character have not in the past worked out to the advantage of Western Australia or of Australia, I approach this Bill in a diffident manner. I am diffident about granting this concession to any company unless I am sure that they will proceed with the work in a reasonable time, and not hawk their Act, if they get it, round the world in an endeavour to obtain capital. The measure should contain a provision that unless the work of construction is begun within a certain time, the advantage in the Bill lapses.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [8.49]: While the member for Mount Magnet (Mr. Troy) was speaking, the Premier interjected to the effect that the Government could at any time purchase this railway at cost. I read Clause 8 differently. It provides that the Government may—



purchase the railway at a sum to be determined by the Engineer-in-Chief, but not to exceed the cost.

We all know that at present the price of railway material is nearly three times what it was before the war; and if the railway is constructed at those very high prices, and later on the cost of railway material falls considerably, it will hardly pay the Government to purchase at cost.

Mr. Teesdale: The clause says that the purchase price is not to exceed the cost.

Mr. ANGELO: That being so, I welcome the Bill. It would be an excellent idea if we could get a company to build this railway at the high prices of material now ruling, and likely to rule for the next year or two, while we would be able to purchase the line in 20 or 30 years' time at the prices of material then ruling. I only wish the same company would make a similar offer to construct the Carnarvon-Gascoyne railway. The construction of the line proposed in this Bill will bring my electorate 80 miles closer to the metropolis. However, the Bill should contain a time limit for the commencement of the work, in the same way as the select committee which inquired into the Bill promoted by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company insisted on a clause which provided that the company must start the work authorised by the Bill within two years.

On motion by the Minister for Works debate adjourned.

#### BILL—LUNACY ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Substitution of new sections for Sections 94 and 95:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Subsection 1 of proposed new Section 94 provides that "there shall be a board of visitors for every institution." Does that mean a separate board for each institution?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No. There is a provision that a board can act in the case of two or more institutions.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Is there need to specify that one member of a board of visitors shall be a legal practitioner?

The Colonial Secretary: It is advisable.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not know that it is. The appointment of members of the board will be entirely in the hands of the Government; and if the Government of the day consider it advisable to have a legal practitioner on the board, they will appoint one. But I am opposed to having it laid down as obligatory on any Government to appoint a legal practitioner. I move an amendment—

That in Subsection 2 of proposed new Section 94 the words "One of such men-

bers shall be a legal practitioner in actual practice" be struck out.

There should be no compulsion on the Government to appoint a man belonging to any particular profession.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I hope the leader of the Opposition will not insist upon his amendment. In England the system is based somewhat on that operating in other parts of the world. The board of commissioners in England consists mainly of medical men and legal practitioners. I think eleven of the 17 come under that category. The commissioners are appointed to control the whole of the institutions in Great Britain. Then there is a visiting committee or a board of management, which manages the institution. We could not carry out that system here on account of the cost, seeing that we have only one institution. The select committee thought it advisable to recommend Parliament to appoint a board somewhat on the lines of the English commissioners, consisting of medical men, a legal practitioner, and lay persons, the board being small in number. I believe that a legal practitioner would be of some use on the board.

The Attorney General: I quite agree with you.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The lawyer's training would come into play in the examination of persons who might appear before the board. Their training makes lawyers much keener than the ordinary layman from that standpoint. That was the principal reason for the select committee recommending that a lawyer should be included on the board.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I rather regret the remarks by the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I did not say that a lawyer was not necessary.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If we are agreed that it is desirable that a legal practitioner should be a member of the board, it is only right that we should say so. The member for North-East Fremantle pointed out what is in accordance with my own limited experience of the lunacy laws in England, when he said that in most cases solicitors are appointed as members of such boards. The reason for that is that a lawyer can judge perhaps better than a layman on the evidence before the board, and this is of particular importance when an unfortunate inmate of the Hospital for the Insane makes a claim for his discharge. I trust that if the Committee desire that a legal practitioner should be on the board the clause will be allowed to stand as it is in the Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Both the Attorney General and the member for North-East Fremantle are really assuming that if my amendment be carried, the Bill will prohibit the appointment of a legal practitioner to the board. I am prepared to agree with what has been said, that it may be advisable to have a lawyer on the board. It might be that a lawyer would be of assistance to

the other members of the board. My amendment would not prohibit the appointment of a legal practitioner, but would leave the clause in such a state that it would be a matter entirely for the judgment and discretion of the Government of the day to make such appointments as they deemed desirable. I do not think it necessary that we should lay it down in this clause and practically restrict the choice of the Government of the day, by stating that a legal man must be appointed. I would leave it purely to the judgment of the executive from time to time to say who shall be members of the board. There are many boards appointed to carry out work under statutes, but I do not know of any instance where it is laid down who shall be members of such boards. It is always left entirely open, and that is all my amendment seeks to do in the present case. I agree with that part of the clause which states that there shall be medical members of the board, because it is largely a medical question which has to be dealt with.

Hon. T. WALKER: The difficulty regarding the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition is that it makes an invidious distinction. If we leave it entirely to the executive for the time being to appoint whoever they think fit, and if we have confidence in their judgment, why mention medical practitioners?

Hon. P. Collier: Surely it is more a medical question than a legal question.

Hon. T. WALKER: It must be clear that it is a medical matter, and that being so, to pursue the line of argument adopted by the leader of the Opposition, it should be unnecessary to mention medical men in connection with the board; it would be taken for granted that no Government would appoint such a board without medical men on it. Yet it is considered necessary by the leader of the Opposition that the medical men should be mentioned, but he would exclude by the express vote of this Committee another section of the community. That is a slur, whether intended or not by the leader of the Opposition I cannot say. In all professions there are doubtless some who would not be regarded with full confidence, but there is no profession more guarded than that of the lawyers. It only requires a report and proof to substantiate it and a lawyer can no longer belong to that profession. I do not know of any body that is more strict in that respect than the legal profession. I do not want to see legal practitioners specially singled out as proposed by the leader of the Opposition. A good lawyer, a man trained regarding evidence and trained to get quickly to the point, to discern what are the facts in connection with any story told to him whether by a patient, an attendant, or a superintendent, would be of great service to the board.

The Colonial Secretary: And he would be able to advise the committee as well.

Hon. T. WALKER: Undoubtedly, that is so. A man trained in that specific groove

would be a valuable acquisition to a board of this kind.

Hon. P. Collier: I would not exclude him.

Hon. T. WALKER: It is very necessary that a lawyer should be on the board, for cases have been known in Western Australia where men have been placed in the lunatic asylum illegally. Some of them have won their liberty on an appeal to the Supreme Court on the score that they were illegally sent there. And we have had to pass special Acts to validate things illegally done under the Lunacy Act. If a board are to have power to recommend the release of patients, they must know that they are acting on legal grounds, and therefore I consider it almost imperative to have on the board a legal practitioner.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Three years is too long for a member of the board to hold office. Powers of removal are provided, it is true, but any Government would hesitate to exercise those powers. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause 3 "three" be struck out and "one" inserted in lieu.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope the amendment will not be pressed. Three years is by no means too long, especially since power of removal is vested in the Governor. Probably the average member of the board will require the first 12 months experience to become fully acquainted with his work, after which his services will be of enhanced value.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Minister is begging the question. Why object to appoint these members every year, seeing that such appointment involves neither trouble nor expense? If the Government found that they had made an injudicious appointment they would have to allow the appointee to remain in office for three years, or alternatively they would cast a reflection upon him by removing him before the expiration of his term. If the period were for 12 months only the Government, at the end of that time, could make a desirable change without reflecting on anybody. The Colonial Secretary, I know, would take a strong stand, would not hesitate to promptly get rid of an unsuitable person—we know that from his attitude towards the Inspector General—but the department will not always be under the administration of the hon. member.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It would be a pity to limit the appointment to one year. A board of five members all of whom are to go out of office at the one time, appointed for a period of only 12 months is not likely to be as effectual as a board appointed for a longer period, the members of which shall go out of office at stated intervals. I realise the difficulties in getting rid of an unsuitable member; yet I do not know that they counterbalance the advantage of having a board with a longer tenure of

office. The leader of the Opposition, of his own experience, must know that appointments are carefully made, and therefore he need not fear that any body so utterly unsuitable for the position as to warrant early removal is likely to be appointed. The method suggested by the Colonial Secretary is more likely to produce satisfactory results than would be a temporary board liable to be totally changed every year.

Hon. P. Collier: You are assuming that the board will not be re-appointed at the end of 12 months.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Possibly they may be re-appointed; possibly there will be a brand-new board. It would be better to make provision for a longer tenure.

Amendment put and negatived.

On motions by the Colonial Secretary, clause further amended by inserting after "chairman" in the first line of Subclause 5 of the proposed new section 94, the words "who shall be a member appointed by the board" and by striking out of Subclause 1 of the proposed new Section 95 the words "which shall include a medical practitioner."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1 of the proposed new Section 95 the following be inserted to stand as paragraph (g): "(g) give instructions to the Superintendent as to the management of the institution, otherwise than in regard to medical treatment of patients, but subject to the approval of the Minister."

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move a further amendment—

That the amendment be amended by striking out "Superintendent" with the view of inserting the words "Inspector General."

The Inspector General is in charge of the institution and any instructions should be given to him as head of the institution.

The Attorney General: Not necessarily.

The Colonial Secretary: The Superintendent manages the institution.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Superintendent does not manage the institution. The Inspector General stated in evidence before the select committee that he did not examine patients because the whole of his time was taken up by the general management of the institution.

The Colonial Secretary: He should examine the patients.

Hon. P. COLLIER: He should, but he does not.

The Colonial Secretary: He shall do so in future.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Perhaps the Minister will bring him up with a round turn.

The Colonial Secretary: He does not need it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, he should be fired out.

The Colonial Secretary: He is a very much misunderstood man.

Mr. Jones: Yes, look at the number of discharges. His figures are wonderful!

Hon. P. COLLIER: Why should the board give instructions to the officer second in command?

The Colonial Secretary: The duties are laid down specifically.

Mr. Jones: Perhaps you intend to abolish the office of Inspector General.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Inspector General is in charge and is responsible. Because there is a Superintendent, that does not relieve the Inspector General of the responsibility.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The "Sunday Times" in its latest issue inferred that the select committee were unfair.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the Minister wishes to discuss matters relating to the institution, does not he call in the Inspector General and give him instructions? It is absurd to suggest that the board should give instructions to the Superintendent.

Mr. Smith: Why stop at the Superintendent?

Hon. P. COLLIER: For everything that takes place in the institution, the Inspector General is responsible. There is nothing that gives the Superintendent powers of administration independent of the Inspector General.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There should not have been a Superintendent.

The Attorney General: Read Section 34 of the Act.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There is nothing in that section which confers on the Superintendent powers independent of the Inspector General. The section merely gives the Government power to appoint a Superintendent. Does the Minister say that the Superintendent has independent powers and may act on vital questions independently of the Inspector General?

The Attorney General: If the Inspector General manages that institution, it is because he is also Superintendent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He is not Superintendent.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course not.

Hon. T. Walker: We have an Inspector General and a Superintendent.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Does the Minister deny that the whole institution is in charge of the Inspector General, and that he is responsible for the conduct, control, and administration of the institution?

The Attorney General: It is not contemplated by the Act.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Then what are the functions and duties of the Inspector General?

The Colonial Secretary: They are laid down in Section 87 of the Act.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I hope Section 87 will be more pertinent than was Section 34. Section 87 gives the Inspector General complete and absolute control. Is it intended

to place the Superintendent in supreme control of the Claremont institution, leaving the Inspector General free to act as a sort of inspector over all the institutions? Section 87 makes the Inspector General entirely responsible.

Mr. Johnston: He may lay down a different policy from the board's instructions.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course. The board may give instructions to the Superintendent, but the Superintendent is subject to the instructions of the Inspector General, which may be contrary to the instructions of the board.

The Attorney General: You want the instructions given to the officer charged with the management of the institution irrespective of whether he is called Superintendent or Inspector General.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I want the instructions given not to a subordinate officer, and the superintendent is a subordinate officer, but to the chief officer. That is only common sense.

The Attorney General: The superintendent is not a subordinate officer.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Inspector General is his superior officer. Can the Minister show where the Act gives the Superintendent powers independent of the Inspector General? The two sections to which I have been referred do not support the Minister's contention.

Mr. Pickering: This is an affront to the Inspector General.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Inspector General should see that the Superintendent gave effect to the instructions of the board.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The reason why the clause is worded in this way is that there are certain duties specifically laid down as being the duties of the superintendent, and there are other duties laid down as being those of the Inspector General. It is intended that instructions shall be given to the superintendent as to the management of the institution other than the medical treatment of patients, because the Government hold the superintendent responsible for the management, and that so far as the medical side is concerned, instructions shall be given to the Inspector General through the Minister in the event of there being any complaint. There are several other institutions over which the Inspector General has control. The management, as such, of the institution at Claremont should, therefore, be in the hands of the superintendent.

Hon. P. COLLIER: How many other institutions are there?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We are preparing plans for another institution to accommodate a large number of patients, and this, too, will be under the control of the Inspector General. Provision will also be made for detention patients. It will thus be seen that the hands of the Inspector General will be full.

Hon. T. WALKER: The proper person to superintend or inspect, or see that everything that is necessary for the welfare of the patients is done, is the Inspector General. He is the person responsible for the efficiency of the staff and the general management of the whole of the institutions for the treatment of the insane. He is also the go between as between the Minister and the institutions. The Inspector General has, at least once in six months, and may, at other reasonable times, to visit every house licensed under the Act for the reception of insane patients only, and shall inquire into the treatment, state of health, etc., of such patients. Early in the year he must make a report in writing to the Minister as to the state and condition of the several hospitals, licensed houses, reception houses, and other places visited by him during the preceding year, and as to the care of the patients therein, and such other particulars as he may think deserving of notice, and a true copy of his report must be laid before both Houses of Parliament in every session. All plans for building or enlarging, or improving, any hospital for the insane, or the criminal insane, reception house, ward or cells for the insane, in any prison must be submitted to the Inspector General, who shall report thereon in writing to the Minister, and no plans shall be carried into effect without such report. I cannot conceive that the Inspector General could have wider supervision over, and be in closer touch with what is going on not only in Claremont but in every institution for the insane. The board that we propose to appoint is to have like powers of visitation to every institution in which a lunatic is housed. The superintendent, however, is only at Claremont and is not at Whitby. The board may find fault with Whitby and not with Claremont. The Inspector General is the one to receive recommendations, complaints, suggestions, as to alterations, and without his approval nothing can be done. The superintendent is a local officer confined to one spot.

Mr. Smith: Does the Minister ever consult the superintendent?

Hon. T. WALKER: I do not suppose he does unless the Inspector General is away.

Mr. Hudson: The Inspector General has supreme control over the staff.

Hon. T. WALKER: Yes, and that includes the superintendent, who is an officer subordinate to the Inspector General. That is clearly laid down in the Act.

The Attorney General: It is not.

Hon. T. WALKER: Down to the minutest details the Inspector General is given control. He has to supervise everything. He has direction over all the institutions for the insane wherever they may be in the State.

The Attorney General: If he has such control, he has not got it from the Act.

Hon. T. WALKER: I say he has.

[Mr. Foley took the Chair.]

The Attorney General: Will you quote the section of the Act which vests in the Inspector General the management of the institution?

Hon. T. WALKER: What more power can he have than that set forth in the Act? He has personal power to say that such and such a method of treating the patients is wrong.

The Attorney General: To whom shall he say that?

Hon. T. WALKER: To those on the spot who are treating patients in a certain way. If his directions were not carried out, there would be reports of an unpleasant nature to the persons concerned, which might result disastrously to them. If that is not power I do not know what power means. He can also inquire whether patients are under restraint. Suppose he finds a patient under restraint who ought not to be under restraint, will he say nothing? Or will he merely say, "That is the Superintendent's job, not mine"? Is not there a clear duty cast on him in this connection by the Act? By clear inference there is. The Act, without being made a mile long, casts upon the Inspector General the duty of remedying whatever is wrong. Similarly with regard to the occupations and amusements of the patients, the examination of books, the making of reports, the inquiring into the treatment of patients. What is the purpose of all these things if he is not to alter anything that is wrong? He has to inquire into the state of health, both bodily and mental, of patients. He has to inquire into the moneys paid for the support of patients. All those onerous duties must have a purpose, and that purpose must be the good management of the institutions, and if necessary their reform. No plans of buildings are to be carried into effect without the prior approval of the Inspector General. He is to bring any defects under the notice not only of subordinates but also of the Minister. If the board reports, it should report to the Inspector General, who has charge of the institutions and is in touch with the Minister, who, in turn, is the source of reform, who has power to dismiss any officer not carrying out the wishes of the Inspector General. Let us put that responsibility on the Inspector General by carrying the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not clearly understand the Minister's new proposal. I do not wish to accuse the Minister of not being honest in this matter, but I have certain doubts as to whether the Government are genuine regarding the appointment of a board of visitors. The very wording of the amendment on the Notice Paper causes me to entertain those doubts. The board may give instructions to the Superintendent, but only subject to the approval of the Minister.

Mr. Jones: And that means the approval of the Inspector General.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The board could not even alter the breakfast of the patients without first going to the Minister for authority. It seems as if the Government are trying to throw dust in the eyes of this Committee. If the Colonial Secretary does not want a board, let him say so straight out. For many years past we have had in this State the position of Superintendent as well as that of Inspector General of the Insane—the latter because it was thought that institutions for the insane would increase in number. But the Government have realised that one officer can hold both the position of Inspector General of the Insane and that of Superintendent. Dr. Montgomery always filled both positions. If the Government intend to dismiss Dr. Anderson so far as the Claremont institution is concerned—I mention Dr. Anderson's name because it is necessary I should do so—and merely make him an inspector under this Bill, the Colonial Secretary ought to tell us so. Neither the Act nor the Bill provides that the Inspector General must actually manage an institution. He can go to the private institution at Cottesloe and inquire whether the place is properly managed, and if it is not properly managed he can instruct its conductors to make alterations. He then becomes what is called in England a Commissioner in Lunacy. I contend that there is no necessity for two officers to manage the one large institution we have at Claremont.

The Colonial Secretary: When was the alteration made?

Hon. P. Collier: About two years ago.

The Colonial Secretary: It was made in 1917.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It was made before the present Colonial Secretary took office. Possibly there might be some advantage in confining the Inspector General to purely inspectorial duties; but can the State afford to do so? If that is not the intention of the Government, is it their intention to keep the Inspector General at Claremont, our only institution of magnitude? If so, the only position for him there is that of Superintendent. Therefore, the only person to whom the board of visitors could give instructions is the Inspector General. If the position were otherwise, the Claremont Superintendent would be not only under the orders of the board of visitors but also under those of the Inspector General, and the board of visitors might give the Superintendent one set of instructions, and the Inspector General might give him a different set. Thus there would be an extreme case of dual control. I never heard of such a fallacy being proposed before. If I had been Dr. Anderson and had been in charge of an institution such as the Claremont Hospital for the Insane, and was told to do this or that, I would have told the Minister to go to some place he would not like to have gone to, and I should have proceeded to find another job. That very action would have been a condemnation of me as the officer in charge

of the institution. If that is to be the position, let the Minister tell us so. There should be only one man in charge of the institution. It would be ridiculous to have the board coming along with their instructions and asking the Minister for his approval before they could be given effect. It would put the Board in an invidious position. I hope that if it is intended to keep the Inspector General there, he will be the man to give instructions.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I saw what was in the mind of the leader of the Opposition when he commenced his speech and that caused me to suggest that he should insert the words "officer in charge of the management of the hospital."

Hon. P. Collier: That was what I wanted to get at, because I considered the Inspector General was in charge.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I knew that and, therefore, made that suggestion. The member for Kanowna entered upon a long dissertation on the meaning of the Act, but I think he was entirely wrong and the member for North-East Fremantle has confirmed my view regarding the Act. Under the Act the Inspector General is a person apart from the management. There is a scheme for an inspector general of all hospitals for the insane. He is to inspect all hospitals, find out the condition of patients at the asylums and to report to the Minister or otherwise. I am responsible for the appearance of the word "superintendent" in the Bill, because I drafted these clauses, and I considered that the person charged with the management is the superintendent. Under Section 34 of the Lunacy Act of 1903 it is provided that the Governor may appoint for every hospital a superintendent who shall be a medical practitioner and a deputy superintendent and such other officers as he may deem necessary. Obviously, if he is not going to manage and be responsible for the institution, he would not be a medical practitioner. Another section of the Act which bears upon the point is Section 178 which shows that in any proceedings taken against a superintendent of a hospital for the insane or for the criminal insane, licensed house, or reception house, the superintendent is the person responsible for the inmates. Thus the superintendent is the person in charge of insane persons, and is the person contemplated as the manager of the institution. In actual practice we have got down to this position, that we have an Inspector General of the Insane who, I presume, receives instructions from the Minister in charge. He is the man who is in charge of the Claremont asylum which is practically the only institution we have.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He was Inspector General and superintendent up to a few years ago.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was power provided that the Inspector General could also be the superintendent. The word

"superintendent" is used in this Bill as the person who has the management of the institution. To remove any doubt about that, if the words "officer charged with the management of the institution" be inserted, that will show that it does not matter whether it is the superintendent or the inspector of insane. The person who is actually in charge of that institution would be the person referred to.

Mr. Hudson: Do you not think the amendment you suggest would be inconsistent with the subclause we have just agreed to?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If the suggestion I make be agreed to, it will make the position quite clear and I do not think the Minister will object to it. There is no desire to have the instructions given to the wrong person. The instructions of the board should be given to the person responsible for the management of the institutions. In this instance, I believe Dr. Anderson is the person charged with the management of the institution. A suggestion has been made that the words "subject to the approval of the Minister" should be inserted. This constitutes a very difficult aspect of the measure. If we are to preserve Ministerial control, instructions given by the board must be subject to the approval of the Minister because he is responsible for what goes on.

Mr. Hudson: Does that not discount the whole effect of the clause?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is not generally; it is in connection with the expenditure of money.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: You might be able to get over it in some other way, but Ministerial control must be preserved.

Mr. BROWN: I intend to support the amendment. If the Act as it stands provides for certain things, the authorities at Claremont have not taken much notice of it. When giving evidence before the select committee, the Inspector General said, "I am the head of the whole department. Next to me is Dr. Bentley, the medical superintendent. He is the second person in charge." Dr. Bentley in his evidence was asked by the chairman whether he was the medical superintendent at the Claremont institution and he replied in the affirmative. The question was asked "Do you know why the appointment of superintendent was made." He replied, "It was largely on the recommendation of the official visitors. They set the ball rolling, and Dr. Anderson agreed that the position was necessary." If the position under the Act provided for the superintendent to take charge it seems strange that Dr. Anderson placed Dr. Bentley in charge.

The Attorney General: It is strange, but that is the scheme of the Act.

Mr. BROWN: So far as I am concerned, the evidence was that there was no actual control by the Inspector General, but he and Dr. Bentley were in joint control. What one did, the other agreed to right through

the piece. I am satisfied that if the clause is passed as it stands, leaving the word "superintendent" in, things will proceed simply as they are going now.

The Attorney General: What about the amendment I suggest?

Mr. BROWN: It is only a quibble of words.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Suppose Dr. Anderson is taken away?

Mr. BROWN: If that were the case—

The Attorney General: The Bill will be useless.

Mr. BROWN: I have dealt with this matter in all fairness. The select committee did excellent work without a tinge of bias or unfairness, and I think that the report which appeared in the "Sunday Times" was biased, unfair and hypocritical. The select committee was appointed by Parliament to get information as to the conditions at the institution. We brought in a report and I am satisfied there was no one member there imbued with any bias towards the institution. I hope the term "superintendent" will be deleted from this clause and the words "Inspector General" inserted. If the board of visitors give instructions to the superintendent, before they can get any further, the superintendent will have to get the approval of the Inspector General. If the Inspector General does not feel inclined to support the superintendent, nothing will be done. I hope the Committee will agree to strike out "superintendent" and not agree to the Attorney General's suggestion but insert the words "Inspector General."

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move—

That the words "Inspector General" be inserted.

The Attorney General: Do not leave it indefinite. Why not insert the words "officer charged with the management of the institution." The Inspector General might not always have those duties.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The insertion of those words would enable those concerned to get round it and it would be just as if "superintendent" were inserted as to put the words suggested by the Attorney General. The object of the Committee would not be achieved if we did as suggested by the Attorney General. The real facts of the matter are that we do not know where we are. The management of this institution seems to be shocking. We have been told over and over again that the superintendent is in charge and is responsible for the whole institution. We have been told that the Inspector General inspects the institutions at Claremont and Whiby and private asylums as well; in other words, that he is an inspector general. The management, control, and responsibility for the Claremont institution, we have been told, rests with the superintendent. The member for Subiaco in a very few words from

the evidence of the Inspector General has shown that that officer said, "I am in charge." In actual practice the Inspector General is in charge; and I say he should be in charge. A mistake was made when the superintendent was put in charge and the Inspector General allowed to lord it round as the inspector of the several institutions. He should retain his responsibility and take instructions from the board.

Mr. Hudson: But instructions can only be given with the approval of the Minister. The position is absurd.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so. I will have something to say on that point later on. Amendment put and passed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should like to know the Minister's interpretation of this second last line of the paragraph—"Give instructions to the Inspector General as to the management of the institution, otherwise than in regard to the medical treatment of patients." For instance, there is the question of exercise; the space allowed for the exercising of patients may be held to come within the category of medical treatment.

The Premier: It would be stretching a point.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There are many questions concerning the welfare of patients, regarding which the board should have power to give instructions; and that welfare would have an effect on the general health and condition of the patients, and therefore might be described as medical treatment. The board might give instructions to reduce the number of patients in a certain exercise yard.

The Colonial Secretary: That would not come within "medical treatment."

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Superintendent could say that it was part of the medical treatment and that therefore the board had nothing to do with it.

Mr. Hudson: It is horribly ambiguous, whatever it may mean.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should like the Minister to explain what is meant by medical treatment.

The Colonial Secretary: "Medical treatment" means the administration of medicine to the patient. No board should give instructions in regard to that. Most certainly the exercise yards do not come within "medical treatment."

Mr. HUDSON: In my opinion the paragraph is absurd. Any close examination of the language used in the drafting of the provision will show that no effort can be seen by its passing.

The Colonial Secretary: A solicitor drafted it.

Mr. HUDSON: We are considering the duties to be cast on the board. The board are directed to enter in the Inspector General's book a minute on the condition of the institution, and such other remarks as they may deem proper. They cannot give instructions without the approval of the Minister. If the Minister sees in the Inspector General's

looks the opinion of the board, that should be sufficient.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We are only progressing line by line. We come to that in the next line.

Mr. HUDSON: I object to progressing line by line in a clause which, on the whole, is absurd.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 the words "subject to the approval of the Minister" be struck out.

The board should be authorised to give certain instructions, not involving considerable expenditure, without going to the Minister.

The Attorney General: Suppose you strike out "approval" and insert "veto."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The board is bound hand and foot. There may be something requiring immediate attention. Why should not the board be authorised to fix it? There are down there many unfortunate persons under the autocratic management of one individual whom the Minister has not time to supervise. The Minister would supervise if it were possible, but no Minister could do so.

The Attorney General: If you preserve his power of veto, you preserve his control.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Is not that the same thing?

The Attorney General: No; before he could not he must have the approval.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the medical officers put patients under restraint unnecessarily, the board could report to the Minister, but under this proposal the board would be unable to move without having the Minister's approval.

The Colonial Secretary: This is intended to prevent extravagant expenditure.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Surely the Government could draft regulations to control the expenditure of the board.

The Attorney General: Where is the power to make regulations?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under Section 177 of the Act. I realise the difficulty. The board might incur an expenditure of a couple of thousand pounds, but the Government could limit their power by regulation. I will, with the permission of the Committee, amend the amendment to make it read—

Strike out "the approval of the Minister" and insert "regulation" in lieu.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member desires to retain the control of the Minister, but does not wish that time should be wasted by referring every little detail to the Minister.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is so.

Amendment put and passed; the new paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

On motion by the Colonial Secretary, the following new subclause was added to the proposed new section 95:—"(4.) The board shall from time to time make reports to the Minister upon the management of the institution, and the observance of the regulation

concerning the welfare and conduct of patients, and may make recommendations with regard to the management, and the amendments of regulations generally. Copies of all such reports and recommendations to be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Amendment of Section 107:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added:—  
"and by adding thereto a paragraph, as follows: Except where a person has been declared of unsound mind under Part 10 and the question was determined by a jury, the judge may, if he thinks fit, on the application of the person so brought before him, order that the question whether such person is of unsound mind be determined by a jury, and in such case the provisions of Section 115 shall apply."

This makes provision for patients who apply for release to have their cases heard before a jury.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I thought at first that it would be advisable to substitute for the word "may" the word "shall," as applying to a judge placing a case before a jury, but I can see now that it is preferable to leave it to the judge to exercise his own discretion.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 13 to 17—agreed to.

Clause 18—Insertion of new section between Sections 187 and 188:

Hon. P. COLLIER: This clause deals with the power of the Inspector General to inflict punishment upon the attendants, and also to impose a fine not exceeding £10. To inflict fines as a punishment is a relic of by-gone days, and should be struck out. It gives the officer in charge of an institution power to reduce the wages of the employee week by week by this means. Either an offence is so trivial that it can be met by reprimand, or it is so serious as to warrant dismissal. No individual should have power to fine at his sweet will. Such a power is likely to be exercised too freely.

The Colonial Secretary: An attendant would sooner pay a fine than be placed in a lower grade or be dismissed.

Mr. Smith: An offending employee should not be permitted to buy retention in his position.

Hon. P. COLLIER: How do the hundreds of thousands of private employees in this State and elsewhere get along without the power of fining their employees?

Mr. Smith: Employees will not stand fines very long.

Mr. Jones: Fining of employees is Prussianism.

Hon. P. COLLIER: An employee who is fined will try to "get his own back." Un-



doubtedly a great deal of the friction between the attendants and the heads at Claremont is due to the fact that numbers of the attendants have been fined. I know of cases where attendants have been fined considerable sums. That kind of thing necessarily breeds antagonism. An offender should be dismissed if the offence is serious; otherwise he should be reprimanded. I move an amendment—

That in line 15 of proposed new section 187a the words "or fine him a sum not exceeding £10" be struck out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope the amendment will not be pressed. The power to fine is necessary. There must be discipline at the institution. A man who is fined can appeal to the board.

Mr. Munsie: But an employee cannot appeal unless he is fined not less than £1. He might be fined 15s. twice in a week, and would have no right of appeal.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The limit of £1 has been imposed for the purpose of checking trivial appeals.

Hon. P. Collier: The Inspector General might keep down fines below £1 in order to prevent the possibility of appeal.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In cases where attendants strike patients, the Inspector General should have power to fine heavily.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course the attendants are always in the wrong.

Mr. JONES: The system of fining employees does not now exist outside Prussian militarism. Throughout the elaborate and extensive asylum system of Great Britain there is no fining of attendants. Does not the Minister know that the attendants at Claremont are absolutely on the verge of a strike?

The Colonial Secretary: You know perfectly well that that is not due to the imposition of fines.

Mr. JONES: It is due in a great measure to despotism.

The Colonial Secretary: It is due largely to your interference.

Mr. JONES: The attendants have turned down the military business of saluting, and they are not going to stand being fined.

The Colonial Secretary: How about the Railway Department? Fines are imposed there.

Mr. JONES: I do not think the railway men will much longer stand being fined. Even if there is militarism in the Railways, that is no reason why it should obtain at Claremont.

Mr. MUNSIE: The amendment should be carried. The system of fines in the Railway Department, quoted by the Minister in justification of this clause, is most pernicious, and is causing much dissatisfaction among the employees. How can there be a contented service at the Hospital for Insane if the Inspector General fines attendants 10s. or 15s., deducts these amounts from their pay, just for trivial offences? If this amend-

ment is defeated, I shall move to delete the limitation of £1 in the matter of the right to appeal.

[Mr. Stubbs resumed the Chair.]

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	..	..	..	16
Noes	..	..	..	16
A tie ..				0

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Brown	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Chessou	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Smith
Mr. Duff	Mr. Troy
Mr. Foley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Holman	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Jones	(Teller.)
Mr. Lambert	

#### NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Money
Mr. Broun	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Draper	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. George	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Maley	(Teller.)
Mr. Mitchell	

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I give my casting vote with the noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I regret very much that there is evidence of the fact that in this Chamber there are those who have not quite got away from the atmosphere of the bond and free days. This provision is certainly reminiscent of the gaol, the military and the lag days, when they flogged men and put them on bread and water. I thought that no modern institution in Australia, Parliamentary or otherwise, would have clung so long to an obsolete principle as that involved in the proposal before the Committee. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the proposed new section—"Provided that no such fine shall be imposed more than once in each year."

The Minister for Works: The next thing will be that we will not be able to sack a man.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Minister has employed men, and I would like to know if he has ever fined a man in his employ.

The Minister for Works: No, except in the railways.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, but not in your private employment.

The Minister for Works: I could sack a man in my private business.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Undoubtedly, and that is the only way in which you can get efficient service. I have employed men and have been employed, and I am able to look at the position from both sides. As an employer I would not have any employee working for me whom I had fined, for I would not expect to get efficient service from him.

Mr. Teesdale: They would sooner you fined them than discharged them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is not so. We have to consider efficiency. If men are not doing their work properly so as to warrant a fine, they should be discharged. It is only in the very rarest of instances that power to fine is given.

Mr. Teesdale: There must be some control over them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: What greater control could we have than the power to dismiss them? I believe in that kind of thing, but I do not believe in the right to fine. If an employee is not giving satisfaction, dismiss him, but do not subject him to fines while still keeping him in his employment.

Mr. Teesdale: Would you dismiss a man for being intoxicated, or would you fine him?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I would caution him the first time and dismiss him if he persisted in repeating the offence. Than the private employers, no section of the community knows better how to obtain efficient service. Do private employers adopt a system of fines? No, because they know it would only tend to inefficiency. A man fined £1 is going to get back on his employer, if he can, by rendering less efficient service. Only in a place like the asylum for the insane is the principle to be found in operation.

The Minister for Works: No private employer would be bothered with it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: For the reason that he knows it would be to his detriment.

The Premier: Parliament would not give him the power.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If he wanted it he could impose it in the conditions of employment.

The Premier: Surely this is for the protection of the employee.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not. The whole principle is bad. The maximum amount of £10 is absurd. A man who commits an offence deserving of a fine of £10 ought to be dismissed outright.

Mr. Teesdale: What about the deterrent effect of having a £10 fine hanging over him?

Hon. P. COLLIER: The risk of dismissal would have a much greater deterrent effect. Fancy imposing a fine of £10 on an employee earning 30s. a week! Far better both for the institution and for the employee that he should be dismissed. I am certain this principle of fines originated in the days when a large number of the citizens of Perth were not free. Surely to goodness we are

past those days. We should try to keep in step with the universal practice of private employers. I realise that a number of members voted without knowing what the question was. It was largely a party vote.

The PREMIER: I think the leader of the Opposition is altogether wrong. If these men commit a small offence for which they should be punished, it will be necessary to dismiss them or reduce them in grade, instead of inflicting a fine of a few shillings. It is all very well for the leader of the Opposition to talk about the iniquity of the fine, but the fine takes the place of dismissal or reduction.

Mr. Munsie: The man has a right of appeal if he is reduced in grade.

The PREMIER: Surely this provision is preferable from the employees' point of view?

Hon. P. Collier: It is out of date and does not obtain anywhere except in this institution.

The PREMIER: It obtains in Government institutions where there is someone to see that the men are treated fairly.

Hon. P. Collier: Would you claim the right as a private employer to fine your employees?

The PREMIER: No, and this House would not give me the right to do so.

Hon. P. Collier: Then why here? What is the difference?

The PREMIER: There is a vast difference. The system of fines obtains in the Railways because privileges are involved, and there is someone to see that an officer is not unduly punished by the imposition of fine upon fine, but is fairly treated. If the leader of the Opposition agrees that the man who transgresses should be dismissed, that will be a simple way out of the difficulty.

Hon. P. Collier: I would permit no employer to fine a man.

Mr. Chesson: Neither would I.

The PREMIER: I do not think the Inspector General should have the right to impose so heavy a fine. If the leader of the Opposition moves to reduce the amount of the fine, that should meet the case. The amendment, however, would make the provision ridiculous, and it would impose on the employees a hardship which was not contemplated.

Mr. TEESDALE: We have had very little complaint from those directly interested.

Mr. O'Loughlin: You do not know them.

Mr. TEESDALE: In the mass of correspondence, I have seen no reference to this iniquitous fine.

Hon. P. Collier: Where is the correspondence?

Mr. TEESDALE: If we made an alteration in this system, the employees might not thank us. They might be more agreeable to this system of small fines than to a threat of dismissal or positive dismissal. It would be a serious matter if small offences were permitted to accumulate and lead to dismissal, whereas under the present system, a

fine of a few shillings would have little effect.

Mr. Jones: It would have a big effect on their children and their homes.

Mr. TEESDALE: The hon. member is not justified in assuming that these high fines would be imposed.

Mr. Jones: A few shillings hits a worker very hard to-day. You want to rob their children. That is your game.

Mr. TEESDALE: They could not rob the hon. member's children.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When I entered Parliament I represented the district in which was situated the Hospital for the Insane, and I continually had objections regarding the fines imposed. A young girl in receipt of £50 a year was fined £5. She was not responsible for what took place and Dr. Montgomery, who was away when the penalty was imposed, remitted the fine. Another girl was fined £3 and another £2. The heads of these institutions have not the same interest in their employees as have private employers. The latter pay regard to the value of an employee, and consider slight breaches from this standpoint. Before drastic action would be taken an employee would be warned to mend his ways.

The Premier: Reduce this amount of £10.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government have no personal interest in the employees. It is of no advantage whether a certain employee stays or goes. For trivial offences fines are imposed, though a reprimand would be sufficient. A man might prefer to be fined rather than lose his job, but heavy fines come very hard upon employees. I suppose that salaries of £100 or £120 a year would represent the maximum.

Mr. Teesdale: The amounts are ridiculous.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Any employee who commits an offence that justifies a fine of £10, or £5, is not fit to continue in his position. The principle is wrong.

Mr. FOLEY: The Minister should reconsider the whole of this clause. Offences might be divided into three classes. The punishment for a first offence should be a reprimand, and if there was a repetition the Inspector General should have the right to lower the grade of the employee. If a man is paid to do a certain job and fails to do it, he cannot expect to receive consideration. Such a case might be met by reducing the employee to a lower grade. If a man commits a like offence a third time he would not be fit to remain in the service. I should like the Minister to wipe out this fine altogether, even if it means recommitting the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope the leader of the Opposition will not press his amendment. If it were carried the Inspector General in dealing with an employee would have to dismiss him, even though the imposition of a fine would in all probability

meet the case. It would be better for the leader of the Opposition to move later to reduce the amount of the fine provided here to a smaller amount. The employee could then appeal to the board in the event of his being fined.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	11
Noes	..	..	..	15
Majority against				4

AYES.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Holman	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Jones	Mr. O'Loghlin
Mr. Lambert	(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Draper	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Maley	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. FOLEY: I wish I could prevail upon the Colonial Secretary to recommit the Bill for the purpose of dealing with this particular clause and cutting out the provision as to the penalty. It is generally agreed that the fine set down here is too great and that it should be reduced to a minimum. The employee should also have the right of appeal in the event of a fine being imposed.

Mr. MUNSIE: I move an amendment—

That in Subsection 3 of proposed new Section 187a the words "a sum exceeding one pound" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 22—agreed to.

New clause:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the following be added to the Bill, to stand as Clause 16: "Section 183 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the deletion of the word 'official' wherever it occurs in Subsection 2 thereof."

This is really a consequential amendment.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

Mr. JONES: I move—

That the following new clause be added to the Bill: "All members of the staff who were dismissed for leaving the institution during the isolation period may appeal, in the prescribed manner and with-

in the prescribed time of this Act becoming law, to the board of visitors." This is in accordance with the findings of the select committee. Many of the officers dismissed were amongst the most capable men employed at the institution. The dismissals took place largely because the Inspector General's dignity has been offended. His dignity has now had a chance to recover, and the men affected should have the right of appealing to the board of visitors. I trust the Government will accept the new clause. One of the men dismissed was actually pushed through the fence by the Inspector General. The select committee recommended that these men should be reinstated as openings offered. I want to give these men a chance.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	10
Noes	..	..	..	19

Majority against .. 9

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Obesson	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munroe
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Holman	(Teller.)
Mr. Jones	

#### NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Broun	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Draper	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Duff	Mr. Smith
Mr. Foley	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. George	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Maley	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Mitchell	(Teller.)

New clause thus negatived.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I intend to move a new clause giving the right to those persons who were dismissed during the influenza epidemic to have their positions given back to them by Act of Parliament. This will give the Committee an opportunity of saying that the recommendations of the select committee shall be carried out. Many of the men were dismissed unfairly. The select committee investigated their cases very closely and found out that a large number of the men should not have been dismissed at all. Some members of Parliament may have altered their views slightly since then, but they were with the committee when the report was discussed in their idea that the men should not have been sacked. The Inspector General of the Insane was guilty of an error of judgment and want of tact, in not giving effect to the committee's recommendations and placing these men on the staff again as vacancies occurred. Unless the officer in charge of the institution is to continue to flout the report of the select

committee and the wishes of Parliament, as expressed by the great majority of members, these men should be reinstated. I defy any member to contradict my statement that some of the most disgraceful things that ever took place in Western Australia occurred in connection with the dismissal of some of these men from the institution. No member of the Committee would allow the Inspector General or a thousand inspectors general to keep him away from his wife in the circumstances one or two of these men found themselves in! Despite the expressed wish of Parliament, announced more than 12 months ago, none of these men has been reinstated. Such proceedings are scandalous, and I do not believe that any hon. member will countenance them! I do not generally adopt a course such as that I am pursuing to-night, but people have certain rights, and when we see that the officer in charge at the institution will not attempt to remedy the injustice that has been done, it is only just that Parliament should see that the wrong is righted. I want to see whether members of the select committee, who spoke very strongly on the matter a long time ago, will still adhere to those views.

Mr. Teesdale: Who are you going to move out to put them back.

Mr. O'Loughlin: They are only to be put back as vacancies occur.

Mr. Jones: Why don't you read the report of the select committee?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know that there have been vacancies, yet none of these men has been put back.

Mr. O'Loughlin: One of the men had 16 years' service.

Hon. P. Collier: He had been to the war, and they have no use for him now. They have done with him.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move—

That the following new clause be added; "All employees dismissed through causes arising out of the influenza epidemic of 1919 shall be reinstated at the Claremont Hospital for the Insane as vacancies occur therein."

I am only asking for justice for these men and merely for what they are entitled to. I am asking for no more than the Inspector General would desire for himself in the same circumstances. The Minister has acted wrongly in not seeing that effect was given to the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Teesdale: What would you have said if the epidemic broke out in the institution and half the patients died?

Mr. O'Loughlin: The Committee went into that aspect.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It was more by good luck than good management that the influenza did not reach the hospital.

Mr. Teesdale: It did not break out, at any rate.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That was not by reason of anything the Inspector General did.

Mr. Teesdale: You exaggerate the whole thing.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Roebourne condemned the action of the Inspector General at the time.

Mr. Teesdale: If it were only the case of the man who went to see his wife, I might have expressed those views.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Some of the men who were chiefly responsible for the trouble at the time were not dismissed. It is well known that in such cases those who are caught are not always those mostly responsible. The Inspector General knew of this and he was wrong in pursuing the line of action which he did. The Inspector General has defied Parliament and even during the last week a paper condemned the select committee for not taking certain evidence. I do not care for the Inspector General or anyone connected with him, but I will see that justice is done to these men if I can. Only last week I had a letter from one of the men who had appealed to the Minister and to the Inspector General to have his case reviewed, but he has no chance whatever.

Hon. P. Collier: And he is not likely to have a chance.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He asked me to move to have the papers in connection with his case placed on the Table, but it is too late in the session to do that. I would sooner see the Inspector General dismissed than this man, for the Inspector General would have a better chance of getting a position elsewhere.

Hon. P. Collier: Not if they knew him.

Mr. Jones: And provided he kept sober.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am sorry that justice has not been done to those men.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would be ridiculous to insert such a clause in such a Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: We cannot get redress by any other means.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Those men went out of the institution of their own accord.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: So did the public service.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They were asked to go back, but refused. When the instructions were given for isolation—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There was no isolation; they were out every night.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If so, it was unknown to the officials.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The officials, the doctors, were out also.

Mr. Jones: He was at the Weld Club.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: But he took every precaution against taking back infection to the institution. He had to go out to attend to the other hospitals under his control. Hon. members opposite have spoken of the Inspector General being intoxicated. Nearly every witness examined by the select committee was asked about that, but it was never admitted that the Inspector General had been intoxicated. I have never seen him

intoxicated, and I do not think any other member ever has.

Mr. Lambert: Speak for yourself on that point.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The men went out of the institution and were given time in which to go back.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: So did the civil service, yet you protected them.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is a different thing.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, for they have more votes in the constituencies.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: These men defied the officials and went out.

Hon. P. Collier: The public service defied the Government for five weeks.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is essential that there should be discipline in the institution.

Mr. Lambert: Why not start it at the head?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Without discipline we should soon have chaos in the institution. If there is chaos there already, it is due to some of the employees not being loyal.

Hon. P. Collier: It is always the fault of the men!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not say it is entirely their fault, but if the men are in fault they must be brought to book.

Mr. Collier: Why is not the Inspector General brought to book when he is in fault?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Has it ever been proved that the Inspector General was in fault. The select committee did not bring any specific charge against him, did not say that he should be dismissed.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The select committee said these men should be reinstated as vacancies occurred.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is so. If the institution is as bad as it is made out to be, why should these men want to go back?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: None but you say that the institution is bad.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The criticism comes from the Opposition.

Mr. Lambert: Not against the institution.

Mr. Jones: But against the Inspector General.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the actions of the Inspector General are so intolerable, why should these men want to go back?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Because it is hoped that, as the result of the work of the select committee, things will be better.

Hon. P. Collier: When out of work, a man with a family cannot select his job.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is plenty of work for all.

Hon. P. Collier: Work which these men are not accustomed to.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope the Committee will not agree to the proposed new clause. The Bill is not the place for it.

It would be better to have a Royal Commission to inquire—

Mr. Jones: We have had one, which recommended this, but you are ignoring it.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Inspector General is temperamentally unfitted to be in his present position. That is the most charitable suggestion which his best friend could make. I did not wish to answer the Minister regarding the Inspector General's sobriety, but I have a vivid recollection of the man when the motion for the appointment of a select committee was before the House. He told me that if Parliament appointed a Royal Commission or a select committee, he would resign. He practically set himself up in defiance of Parliament itself. This is the class of man of whose actions we are asked to take a benevolent view. We should be particularly guarded in respect to any power which we give him. While many of these attendants might have done wrong, the Inspector General has been equally wrong on many occasions. Evidence of this is found in the fact that the Inspector General has shown not the slightest inclination to give effect to the recommendation of the select committee, after a very exhaustive and impartial inquiry.

Mr. Luley: He has deliberately flouted their recommendation.

Mr. LAMBERT: Some members are more intimately acquainted with this subject than am I, but it is to be regretted if the Minister has not a good knowledge of the Inspector General. I believe that the Minister is endeavouring to be honest in his statement to us, and while we hesitate to lay a charge against the Inspector General, the Minister if he had any dealings with this man—

The Premier: What is the use of talking like that about Dr. Anderson?

Mr. LAMBERT: I am taking a very benevolent view.

The Premier: You are not.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am now referring only to the Minister's knowledge of the Inspector General. It is regretted that he has not a more intimate knowledge of the Inspector General. If he were more intimately acquainted with him, he would have agreed to the deletion of many of these penal clauses. I think that if the Minister has the administration of this measure for any length of time, he will live to regret the adoption of the penal clauses. Some recognition should be given to the men who left the institution. Their action is on all-fours with that of the civil servants. The attendants might have been indiscreet but indiscretion should not be penalised to such an extent, and if the Inspector General will not show some sign of reasonable tolerance, Parliament should, by inserting such a sub-clause, make it mandatory for him to do so.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Minister has suggested that we should have harmony in this institution. There are other institutions where a little harmony should prevail, particularly at this hour of the night. It is

hardly fair to ask members to continue the discussion of an important measure when the Government are resisting every proposal from this side of the House to make it a good measure. The Minister is not profiting from his Parliamentary experience when he says that this is a new method to improve a Bill. The hon. member, driven to desperation in his efforts to find a remedy, has moved the amendment. I regret that the original amendment was defeated, because I attach a good deal of importance to the findings of Royal Commissions and of select committees. If Parliament appoint men to act on a committee, charged with the duty of weighing and analysing all the available evidence and making recommendations with respect thereto, such recommendations should be carried into effect. I understand that you, Mr. Stubbs, were a member of the select committee, and I should be pleased to see you get relieved from the Chair for the time being, in order to fortify the finding of the select committee regarding the attendants who were dismissed. The Minister may argue that the institution is not an attractive place at which to be employed. He wants to know why these men wish to go back. It is difficult to state the reasons which actuate people in undertaking certain propositions, but there are men eager to get back to this calling, because it is the only calling they know. They have followed it for years, and they might be inefficient in any other calling. It may be that some have established homes adjacent to the institution, and no man likes to travel to the other end of the State for employment. If deprived of employment at the institution it is only logical and reasonable to assume that a man would endeavour to get reinstated. The Minister said there is no need for these men to take on this work, and that there is any amount of work available. That statement does not apply to the metropolitan area. If a man has a home in the metropolitan area, his natural desire is to live there, and not to accept work at a distance and involve the keeping of two homes. I know one of the finest young fellows of this city who is out of work, and I have been to a dozen people in Perth seeking to get employment for him. He is a sober boy, the winner of a Victoria Cross in the recent war, and he cannot get a job in the metropolitan area.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If the Labour party had been in office, there would have been a great agitation raised about that.

Mr. Smith: What is his name?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Axford. He is a hard working young chap. He has been employed for 10 days by Wigg & Co., and I hope that he will get a fixed job to-morrow.

Mr. Smith: At what sort of work?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: At any work, labouring. However, I do not wish to stress this individual case. Some of these ex-attendants may have homes near to the institution, and would prefer to live there and be at their

old work, rather than go to the country, where I admit there is plenty of work, and thereby have to keep two homes going. Work is not plentiful in the metropolitan area.

The Premier: It will become scarcer and scarcer in the metropolitan area.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: That makes the claims of these men for reinstatement all the stronger, seeing that they have been residing in the metropolitan area and have been endeavouring to provide homes for themselves. I support the finding of the select committee, and I claim that the Minister in charge of the department should pay some regard to the finding of his colleagues who devoted much time to gathering the information which Parliament required. The original clause moved by the member for Fremantle should have been carried, but now the member for North-East Fremantle is seeking to attain the same end by adopting what the Minister has said are novel methods. If the amendment is accepted, tardy justice will be done to a few men. The select committee found in their favour and a majority of the committee comprised members from the Government side of the House. They demonstrated that the men's case was right, and showed their honesty by making a recommendation.

The Premier: The select committee never said that the men acted rightly in walking out of the institution.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The men had been in certain employment for a considerable number of years and something happened as a result of which their employment was terminated. If they were guilty they paid the penalty. The officers of the institution should be only too eager to take them back and have the benefit of their experience. Such experience must count in an institution like that. Parliament would not be doing right unless it adopted the recommendation of the select committee and gave these men an opportunity of returning to their employment as vacancies occurred.

Mr. Smith: Has none been reinstated?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: We are justified in assuming that none of them has been reinstated. If this had been done, it would have exonerated the Inspector General of the charge that he had shown vindictiveness towards them. That vindictiveness of spirit should not exist in a public department. After this lapse of time the Inspector General would not be hurt and the Government would suffer no indignity by the reinstatement of these men. If these men were allowed to go back I am convinced they would perform their duties with satisfaction to all concerned.

Mr. ANGELO: The select committee recommended that these men should be reinstated. Notwithstanding this, one or two of them who applied for re-employment were refused it. The recommendation should be carried into effect. I cannot agree with the proposal now before the Committee, but if

anyone will move that, in the opinion of the House, the recommendations of the select committee should be given effect to, I will do my utmost to see that such a motion is passed.

Mr. Jones: It would be a pious resolution; nothing more.

[Hon. G. Taylor took the Chair.]

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I am of opinion that we should take notice of what has been put before us by the select committee. Not to do so would be tantamount to flouting the recommendations of the committee. Some means should be found to overcome the present difficulty.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Every suggestion that has been made that seems to run counter to the desires of the Inspector General has been resisted to the utmost by the Minister. He is either greatly under the dominating influence of that officer or has very complete confidence in him. Great stress has been laid on the question of discipline. These men defied the Inspector General and left the institution, and in order that discipline might be preserved, they were punished by being permanently dismissed. Let me contrast that action with the attitude of the Government towards the public servants. Some thousands of public servants defied the Government and the people of the State. They engaged in what was termed a rebellion. Not only did the Government ask them to return to duty, but specially inserted a clause in the Bill, which has been before us, protecting all their right and privileges. The public servants numbered thousands. They have influence in many constituencies and the general elections are not far off. Their offence was looked upon with the greatest leniency. The 15 or 16 men who were dismissed from the Claremont institution are not likely to exercise much influence on the coming election. Can the Minister justify the action of the Government in connection with the public servants in comparison with their autocratic attitude towards this unfortunate handful of men? The proposed new clause does not differ in principle from the relative clause in the Public Service Appeal Board Bill, which says that there should be no victimisation. And this amendment practically says that these men shall not be victimised, but that they shall be reinstated as opportunity offers. Wherein do the two provisions differ in principle? Not in any respect. More than half the men concerned were returned soldiers. A number of them had excellent grounds for breaking quarantine. One—a returned soldier—broke it because his wife was about to undergo a serious operation, which might have proved fatal. Contrast that man's case with the case of public servants on from £600 to £800 per annum who struck for higher pay, though they most assuredly could not be described as getting less than a living wage. The Minister who stands by those public servants backs up the Inspector Gen-

eral in his refusal to re-employ that returned soldier at Claremont. The Inspector General is an absolute autocrat, who gets his own way no matter what the result may be. If the Minister wishes to mete out not less justice to these attendants than was granted to the public servants, let him instruct the Inspector General to re-employ the men. An absolute fetish is being made of discipline at Claremont. The amendment is a very moderate one, and not novel, as a similar provision has been passed for the benefit of public servants. Some of the attendants concerned have been employed at Claremont for years and are not fitted to take up the only pursuit now available to them, hard labouring work in the country.

Mr. STUBBS: Having been a member of the select committee which inquired into the management of the Claremont institution, I stand here to speak on the grave injustice which has been done to certain attendants. From what I heard during the inquiry, I am of opinion that quite a number of breaches of the regulations were winked at by the asylum authorities, and that it was not due to the strictness of those authorities that the influenza was kept out of the asylum. It was news to me when I heard to-night that the select committee's recommendation had not been carried out. At the inquiry an attendant stated on oath that he was denied permission to visit his wife, who was about to undergo what might have proved a fatal operation.

Mr. Teesdale: It is not fair to quote a single case.

Hon. P. Collier: That man is out; he is suffering.

Mr. STUBBS: I can quote other cases which the member for Rochourne (Mr. Teesdale) might like to hear. Some of the witnesses testified that when the Inspector General passed through the yard they had to stand at attention and salute. The select committee's recommendations were very mild, and might well have been made much stronger. In future, before consenting to serve on a select committee I shall require an assurance from the Government that they will give effect to such committee's recommendations. It is time alterations were made in the management of the Claremont institution. I hope that before the House rises the Premier will intimate that as regards these attendants the select committee's recommendation will be carried into effect.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am perfectly well aware that it is unusual to put a new clause of this nature in a Bill.

The Attorney General: Have you ever known of any such clause being inserted?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Probably not.

Hon. P. Collier: It is just the same as the Government's Public Service Appeal Board Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no other way in which this matter can be dealt with, as the Minister did not give us an oppor-

tunity of discussing it earlier. He simply sat down without saying a word regarding the previous amendment. I have a letter from one of the men, dated 7th November, in which the man complains he cannot get any satisfaction whatever. He wrote asking me to try to get an inquiry held. He is a returned soldier and was informed that he was "wrong in the head." That is what the doctor told him. That was the reason why he resigned his position under protest, in order to get an inquiry. He wrote to the doctor and also to the Minister asking for an inquiry, but without even receiving a reply. When he came back from the Front, Dr. Moxon informed him that he was hardly fit to take up the position, but he wanted to go back to work. That man has been victimised on account of the trouble, although he had spent years at the institution and had a first class certificate. The man is quite right when he asserts that he was no worse than others who stole out of the institution at night under cover of darkness, and yet those men are still employed at the institution.

The Colonial Secretary: He was caught outside the institution.

Mr. Jones: There is the poor, feeble mouthpiece of the Inspector General again.

Hon. P. Collier: He was a returned soldier, that was all that was wrong with him.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The trouble about the man I refer to was that he took the chair at a meeting of the employees. He had been at the war for a year or two fighting for the Inspector General and hon. members; nothing else was wrong with him. If the Minister for Works had been in charge of this department these men would have been back long before this. He has backbone enough not to allow a man like Dr. Anderson to control him.

The Colonial Secretary: If a man was in your employ and you told him to do something which he refused to do, would you not dismiss him?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It would all depend on the value of that man to me. What about the doctor in this instance? He went out of the institution continually, and thus risked taking influenza into the asylum.

The Colonial Secretary: But he did not do so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It was not his fault, and, moreover, he allowed others to go in and out during that period. The Minister dare not take the same attitude with the civil servants as he has done with regard to these attendants.

The Colonial Secretary: It is a different case altogether.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government practically went on their hands and knees to get them to go back.

The Minister for Works: We did not do that by any means.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And in addition the Government introduced legislation such as is unknown in any other part of the



world. All that I am asking for is justice for these men.

Mr. Teesdale: This condoning of defiance will act as a boomerang on your people one of these days.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member expressed himself in no uncertain terms regarding the Inspector General some time ago.

Mr. Teesdale: I may have, but you probably were mentioning one case.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No one seems to care so far as these men are concerned, although when it is a matter of a man receiving £400 or £500, we are asked to consider him, Parliament is deteriorating a good deal, and I regret that we have not the force and power of Mr. Speaker of some years ago to help us to fight for justice for these men. The Minister has not the backbone to carry out the recommendations of the select committee.

New clause put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	12
Noes	..	..	..	17

Majority against	..	..	5
------------------	----	----	---

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Collier	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Munro
Mr. Holman	Mr. Smith
Mr. Jones	Mr. O'Loghlin
	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Draper	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Duff	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Foley	Mr. Thomson
Mr. George	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Maley	(Teller.)

New clause thus negatived.

New clause:

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move—

That the following new clause be added: "No employee of the Claremont asylum shall be prejudiced in respect of privileges, promotion, or continuity of service by reason only of the simultaneous cessation of work which occurred during the isolation period in 1919."

For the wording of the clause I am indebted to the clause in the Public Service Appeal Board Bill, save that I have substituted the words "employee of the Claremont asylum" for the words "public servant." Surely there can be nothing inconsistent in following in this Bill the lines followed in the Public Service Appeal Board Bill. I do not

think any hon. member voted against this clause in that Bill. Where is the consistency, where the honesty of members who will vote for a clause in one Bill and oppose it in another? It is downright rank, wretched hypocrisy for members to vote for a clause in the Public Service Appeal Board Bill and oppose the same clause when it is affecting only 14 or 15 electors. I have never before seen any Government take up such a wretched, paltry, inconsistent attitude. The Colonial Secretary says, "These men shall suffer." Yet most of those supporting the Minister take a diametrically opposed attitude towards the public service. The Government went down on their knees to an organisation numbering thousands.

The Premier: We did not do it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: How does the Premier reconcile the attitude of his Government towards the public service with the attitude of the Colonial Secretary towards these men? Was the work in which these men were engaged of such greater importance than the work of the public service that they must receive greater punishment? Surely the offence committed by the public servants in practically holding up the functions of government was equally great, if not greater than that committed by these men. I am not seeking to justify the attitude adopted by all these attendants, but not one man of the thousands of public servants who went on strike had such justification for defying the authority of the Government as had the one man who went out of the institution to see his wife. Yet the public servants are all back in their jobs without punishment; they are all to retain their privileges, their continuity of service, their right to promotion, but this attendant who went out to see his wife has to remain out. If the Minister had selected the cases of those men who were least guilty, and whose offence could reasonably and legitimately have been condoned, such as the man who went out to see his wife, and if the Minister had said—"I have given effect to the recommendation of the select committee to this extent that I have investigated each case on its merits and can justifiably reinstate certain men, but notwithstanding the recommendation of the select committee I would not be justified in reinstating the other men," I believe that the House would have accepted his decision. We would then have known that the Minister had made an honest attempt to give effect to the recommendation of the select committee, and had attempted to meet them, having due regard for discipline and other considerations. But the Minister, after a lapse of 12 months, admits that he has done nothing whatever; he has not given consideration to the merits of any case, and we are therefore justified in giving him definite instructions in the measure dealing with the institution. It might be unusual, but it is not any more unusual—

The Premier: You do not think that these men were right in leaving the institution?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Does the Premier think that the public servants were right in leaving their posts?

The Premier: No, I do not. That was a very different matter.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Wherein was it different?

The Premier: Of course it was different.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course, in that the whole community were inconvenienced during the period of the strike and the whole government of State was at a standstill.

The Premier: By men, some of whom were getting £500 and £600 a year.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Does the Premier say that the offence of these attendants, or of some of them, was greater and therefore deserved greater punishment than the offence of the public servants?

The Premier: It is necessary to have control at an asylum.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And presumably it does not matter whether we have control of the government or not.

The Premier: Yes, it does.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Apparently the function of government is not of great importance.

The Premier: The one has nothing to do with the other.

Hon. P. COLLIER: They are parallel cases.

The Premier: We have hundreds of strikes.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, and the Premier knows that at the settlement of all strikes whether by negotiation, conference, or otherwise, one of the first clauses of the agreement is that there shall be no victimisation.

The Premier: What occurred at Claremont was not a strike.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, the attendants ceased work. They defied authority.

The Premier: They left their employment.

Hon. P. COLLIER: They were dismissed for going out.

Mr. Jones: They reported back for work in the morning.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And they were dismissed; they were refused employment. They defied the authority of the man in charge. Did not the public servants defy the authority of the Government and of the people of this State? If not, what were they doing? Were they on holiday with the consent, endorsement or approval of the Government, or were they defying the Government and the whole of the people?

The Premier: Yes, they were defying Parliament, Government and everybody.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Just as in the case of the Claremont attendants. How can the Premier justify the clause in the Public Service Appeal Board Bill and oppose an identical clause in this Bill? I am asking for no more than was granted to the civil servants.

The Premier: You say that every man who has ever been dismissed from the Government service must be reinstated.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, I do not.

The Premier: You ought to, if you urge this.

Mr. O'Loughlen: This is the recommendation of the select committee.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The logic of the Premier is remarkable.

Mr. Jones: That is due to the early hour of the morning.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The difference between these asylum attendants and the public servants is that the latter comprise a powerful organisation numbering many thousands; the others consist of only a few individuals.

The Premier: That is not so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I shall be glad to have the position explained. I claim the support of every member who supported the clause in the Public Service Appeal Board Bill.

The Premier: There is no harm in claiming it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You will be hypocrites if you do not support it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If any member proposes to vote against it, I should like to hear his reasons.

The Premier: But you cannot make him give them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should like to know how such a member can claim to be consistent. The member for East Perth (Mr. Hardwick) is taking a deep interest in this debate.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A few of these men live in East Perth.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The member for East Perth supported the clause in the Public Service Appeal Board Bill.

Mr. Hardwick: They are not parallel cases.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Explain in what way.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should be glad to hear an elaboration as to the respects in which these cases are not parallel. The Minister has not dealt fairly with the House, in that he has entirely ignored the recommendation of the select committee. It is a farce to appoint select committees to take evidence at considerable cost to the community and make recommendations, which apparently are merely thrown in the waste paper basket, because they do not suit a certain official. The Minister has treated the committee with scant courtesy. If the Minister had reinstated but a few of these attendants, he could have shown an honest attempt to give effect to the recommendation. About one-half of the men concerned are returned soldiers. Are they not entitled to a little consideration? Are not we justified in overlooking any little shortcomings on their part? Has not it been spread broadcast that it is our duty to overlook their shortcomings?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, before they went away. Not since they came back.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Even though they were guilty of an offence, should not we bear in mind the lines—

Then gently scan your brother man,  
Still gentler, sister woman;  
Though they may gang a kennin' wrang,  
To step aside is human.

Those lines were written by the great democratic poet whom the member for East Perth is so fond of quoting. To overlook and forgive is humane. If we cannot overlook such things in returned soldiers, we are poor men.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Very few members can vote against the new clause as now proposed by the leader of the Opposition. We are asking the Committee to serve alike all servants of the State. Thousands of public servants were forgiven for what they did in the recent strike, but a very much smaller number of public servants are still suffering for what they did. The Government are not worthy of the name of a Government if they do not serve all alike. It will be done if it takes years to do, and if someone else has to suffer for it. The political pendulum is bound to swing over at some time or another. When it does, we are not going to keep a man in office who browbeats the Government. We are not going to have an autocrat who defies Parliament.

Mr. O'Loughlen: He is no worse than hon. members who have supported his view tonight.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They are supporting their party. Many of them have expressed the opinion that this view is not the right one, but when it came to a question of voting they voted the other way. These employees acted wrongly. When they saw the error of their ways they returned to duty but were refused employment.

The Premier: Do you suggest that men should go out when they please and expect to be taken back?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I only suggest that they should be fairly dealt with. The officers of the institution were as bad as the men.

The Premier: That does not excuse either side.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the officers were praised for their actions while the men were punished. The officers even tried to prevent the men from getting employment elsewhere.

The Premier: They would have no right to do that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If Parliament were true to itself this sort of thing would not be allowed. I am not interested in any of the men but I do want to see them get justice.

The Premier: You do not suggest that they were blameless?

Mr. O'Loughlen: No, but the select committee recommended that they should be reinstated. They have paid the penalty. The man who argues against that is devoid of human sympathy and is a hypocrite.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Inspector General was worse than the men. He went out as often as he pleased and allowed others to do so. Because these men went out openly, they were punished, although they returned the next day. There was no tact used in dealing with them. Everything was done that was calculated to stir them up.

The Premier: Did the doctors go out freely?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, they were out frequently. The Inspector General went out whenever he liked, and yet, according to the Colonial Secretary, there was no possible danger of his carrying the epidemic into the institution. I am sorry the Premier does not put his foot down and tell his Minister, who ought to have more sense, that justice shall be done to these men. When in the course of a few months a new Minister is in the office of the Colonial Secretary, he will see that the select committee's recommendation is carried out. I do not blame hon. members opposite for being loyal to their party, but the recommendation of the select committee should be supported by the Chamber. The present Government have no sympathy with persons distressed as these men are. So long as Ministers are backed up by a few members, they treat the Inspector General as if he were God Almighty.

The Premier: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I regret keeping hon. members here so late, but while the Minister refuses to do justice time is of no account. I am asking for justice to be done to men of whom several have fought for us on the battlefield. Is Parliament to govern the country, or is Dr. Anderson to govern it? Ministers must be standing on very weak ground if they refuse these men an inquiry. Further, if there was an honest desire on the part of the Government to carry out the wishes of Parliament, they would instruct the Inspector General to reinstate these men, and, if he refused, tell him to get out and make room for someone else. The Government cry out about discipline, but there must be discipline in the head of the institution as well as in those under him. A bad boss makes bad employees, but a good boss very rarely has trouble with his men.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Wednesday).